



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 2001

No. 85

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PENCE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 19, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE PENCE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

THE TIME IS NOW TO CONSIDER IMPACTS OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week President Bush met with European leaders to discuss, along with other important policy issues, his dismissal of the Kyoto Protocol and the administration's minimization of global climate change.

I personally find it interesting that while the President feels we need to hold off taking action on global warming and instead need to study it more,

at the same time he was discussing with our European allies his willingness to advance a national missile defense system that is unproven, expensive, and diplomatically unpopular with less likelihood of destruction, frankly, than what we face with global climate change. Three thousand international scientists and the National Academy of Science have all agreed: global warming is real and we are beginning to see the impacts in the rise of extreme weather episodes that have struck the United States in the past few years.

Indeed, it was ironic that at the time the President was minimizing global climate change and heading off to Europe, his home State of Texas was visited by Tropical Storm Allison that hit with brutal ferocity. It killed 22 people in Houston. It rained 3 feet in less than a week, most of it in a single 24-hour period, an unprecedented flood, some would suggest.

Damages were estimated at \$2 billion in Houston alone, and 28 counties were declared Federal disaster areas. We saw what some scientists feel is a glimpse of the problem in the future, like the woman who was alone in an elevator when the power went out and they are programmed, of course, to go to the bottom floor. Unfortunately, in this case, the bottom 4 floors were flooded, causing the woman to drown. Or the man who was trying to save his television in the midst of a flood and was electrocuted when he touched the antenna, and his mother electrocuted trying to help him.

Now, it is inconvenient, it is dangerous, and it is beyond the notion of a few planes canceled, although Continental Airlines canceled 1,000 flights, while the Houston International Airport was closed. Mr. Speaker, a devastating example of the expected human and economic costs associated with global climate change.

Now, at the same time, we in Congress are pursuing policies that may

make the impact of tropical storms and hurricanes worse as far as our coastal communities are concerned. I was struck by an editorial article in this Sunday's Washington Post by geologist Orrin Pilkey urging Congress to work with the administration on pursuing smarter policies and investments along our Nation's thousands of miles of coastline.

He cited one particular area that needed special scrutiny, and the Federal Government has embarked upon what, in many cases, can be termed an ill-advised action of steadily nourishing these beaches. In some cases, we have seen examples where they appear for legislative authorization without extensive interaction on this Chamber floor; at the same time, in much the same manner where the Corps of Engineers over the years have reduced the size of flood plains and increased the potential of damage by building one dyke and dam after another. Non-engineering solutions for beaches are seldom considered, and have the potential of increasing the risk. As we have an artificially rebuilt beach, it encourages people to develop in areas that are ecologically not sustainable.

Already, more than 300 East Coast and Gulf Coast beaches have been nourished; and more are being added to the list all the time. Last year in WRDA, without extensive debate on this floor, we added a 14-mile long Outer Banks beach nourishment project in North Carolina that has a projected cost of almost \$2 billion over the next 50 years. It boils down to a subsidy of \$30,000 per year for 50 years for each beachfront property that is supposed to be protected by this new beach.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it is time for the Members of the House of Representatives to consider the impacts of global climate change and to eliminate subsidies and government actions that will make the impacts and costs worse over time. Looking at

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3209

these existing policies at the same time we work towards global solutions for the impact of global climate change is the key to making our families safe, healthy, and economically secure for more livable communities tomorrow.

THE CHILDREN LEFT BEHIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my concerns to the House to consider the children who will be left behind in H.R. 1 and S. 1.

As House and Senate conferees begin meeting to consolidate the House and Senate bills which will reauthorize the elementary and secondary education act, I urge the House to consider the reality that the children living in U.S. insular areas like Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands will be left behind in this reauthorization bill.

The President's education plan to "Leave No Child Behind" is woven into the language of H.R. 1 and S. 1, which are our blueprints for elementary and secondary education in this country. While these bills give special attention to the needs of children living in rural areas, the needs of American Indian, native Hawaiian and Alaskan native children, the needs of children with limited English proficiency, the needs of children of military families, it fails to begin addressing the needs of children living in the insular areas.

Although the insular areas have a unique status under Federal law which requires special policies to serve the educational needs of children, there is no Federal educational policy that focuses on the specific and unique needs of insular area school systems.

It is difficult for insular area systems to compete for educational funding distributed by competitive grants because schools lack the personnel needed to prepare grant applications. They are also faced with unique challenges in hiring and retaining qualified administrators and certified school teachers. Insular area educational systems face other challenges such as geographical barriers, high unemployment rates, shrinking economies, aging buildings which are strained by the acceleration of weathering caused by an unforgiving tropical environment, the high cost of importing and providing equipment and supplies, and a host of other limited resources.

As the delegate from Guam to the U.S. House and a lifelong educator, I have always advocated for improvements in the manner in which the Federal policy is developed by the Federal Government in its treatment of the insular areas. Gratefully, the insular areas are included in most educational programs, but mostly as afterthoughts. As a result, educators in the insular

areas must follow a patchwork system of funding arrangements varying from State shares to special formulas for outlying areas in order to obtain needed and fair funding of Federal program resources. I am pleased to note that the territories are included in many of the increases, including the President's proposal to increase by \$5 billion reading programs from kindergarten to third grade.

But I am also concerned that H.R. 1 leaves out funding for parental assistance centers. In my home, the Guam sanctuary program has a program called Ayuda Para I Manaina, Help For Parents, which provides services for over 1,000 families on Guam each year. The Senate bill includes funding for this program, but the House does not, and I urge my House colleagues to recede to the Senate.

I have been a longtime advocate for establishing a Federal educational policy for the insular areas that would help bring consistency to their treatment throughout H.R. 1. In the absence of such a policy, I proposed an amendment which would require a Federal policy for the insular areas. Unfortunately, this amendment was struck down along with over 100 other amendments proposed for H.R. 1.

So I stand again before my colleagues today to urge consideration for the special needs of children in the territories. The Federal Government has recognized that special attention must be given to the challenging circumstances of insular area educational systems. Why should our educators be left searching for information in footnotes and obscure reference to find the policies which apply to them? We need to work in concert to level the playing field for all American children wherever they live, whether they live in a State or whether they live in a territory.

I hope my colleagues will join in supporting this proposed amendment to ensure that no American child is left behind in our national educational programs, no matter where they live.

I also would like, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge the presence of Paulo Madlambayan, who is our congressional art contest winner from Guam. He came the furthest to be with us today with the other congressional art contest winners, along with his Uncle Jesse.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 p.m.

The Reverend Joseph A. Escobar, Pastor, St. Anthony's Catholic Church, Pawtucket, Rhode Island, offered the following prayer:

Let us remember that we are one Nation under God.

O God, our help, our justice, hear our prayer as we begin this session of the House of Representatives. Enlighten our deliberations by the light of Your law, so that our legislation may reflect Your divine wisdom. May we keep before our eyes the truth that we have been created in Your image, that each man and woman has a dignity which we have been empowered to preserve and to protect.

Help us to see that dignity in each other and in those who have empowered us to serve. May we build a society wherein we can live in a harmony which reflects the harmony in which You created our world. We place our confidence in Your saving help this day and every day, for in You we trust. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE REVEREND JOSEPH A. ESCOBAR

(Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Father Joseph Escobar of St. Anthony's Church in Pawtucket, Rhode Island as our guest chaplain.

Established in 1926, St. Anthony's has long served Rhode Island's English and Portuguese-speaking communities.

The large influx of Portuguese immigrants to Rhode Island resulted in the first Portuguese parish in the State, Holy Rosary Parish in 1885. Next was St. Elizabeth's, in Bristol in 1913. It was soon followed by St. Francis Xavier in East Providence in 1915; and St. Anthony's was added in 1926, along with its mission at Little Compton.

Father Escobar will soon be leaving to transition to be the pastor of Our Lady of the Rosary Church in Providence, his hometown. Father Escobar was educated in East Providence public

schools before attending Providence College, my alma mater, where he received a BA in mathematics. He completed his seminary studies at the Dominican House of Studies right here in the Washington, D.C. area.

He was soon ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Francis X. Roque in Washington, D.C. on May 20, 1988, and returned to Providence College where he worked towards a Master's Degree in the Religious Studies program.

He served as assistant pastor at St. Pius the Fifth Church in Providence, and St. Elizabeth Church in Bristol, Rhode Island. Father Escobar has been the administrator of St. Anthony's Parish in Pawtucket since 1977. He was incardinated into the diocese of Providence in 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that parishioners of St. Anthony's will miss him as much as his new flock at Our Lady of the Rosary are looking forward to greeting him. It was an honor and privilege to welcome Father Escobar to this United States House of Representatives, and I thank him for his invocation.

PRESIDENT'S DECISION ON VIEQUES WILL BE SHOWN TO BE WISE AND INSIGHTFUL

(Mr. WICKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WICKER. Madam Speaker, please put me down as one of a substantial number of Republicans who applaud the decision of President Bush to discontinue our Naval training on the island of Vieques.

As Secretary England pointed out last week, this decision is the best way to decompress a highly charged situation which was clouding other issues between Puerto Rico and the mainland. The Bush administration has made it clear that, while providing effective training for Naval forces is our first priority, alternative sites already exist and other ranges can and will be found. I hope this can be done before May 2003.

To those who decry the "political" nature of this action, I invite them to go to Puerto Rico, listen to the people and gauge the depth of their intensity and ask this: Does anyone realistically believe it is in our national interest to disregard, year after year, the overwhelming popular will of our United States citizens on Puerto Rico? The President's decision will be shown to be wise and insightful.

CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL AWARDED TO GERMAN COMPANY WITH NAZI ROOTS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, first the Air Force buys Chinese boots.

Then the Pentagon buys black berets made in China. To boot, visitors at Quantico get gifts from the Marines made in China.

If that is not enough to spoil your Chinese dinner, digest this, Congress: U.S. bureaucrats awarded a construction contract for the new World War II Memorial to be built on The Mall to a German company with Nazi roots. A German company that built war planes for the Nazis, that helped kill hundreds of thousands of American troops. Unbelievable. What is next, a Nazi memorial on the World War II sites? Beam me up.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the need for Congress to hire a proctologist to train Pentagon procurement officials on the buy American laws.

BRING MONTGOMERY GI BILL INTO 21ST CENTURY

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I am so appreciative that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) points out from time to time the seemingly nonsensical approach that Washington bureaucrats can take to the challenges we confront. How refreshing it is, Madam Speaker, that today on this House floor, we can strike a bipartisan blow for common sense as we bring the GI bill into the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, a decisive bipartisan majority is poised to pass this bill that will increase benefits some 70 percent because we understand to maintain the integrity of our all-volunteer force, we need to have that promise of education.

The former senator from Arizona, Ernest McFarland, is part of this tradition, in the post World War II days; and our former colleague and former chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Sonny Montgomery of Mississippi, also striking a blow; along with the dean of our delegation, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP). We thank them for this commonsense legislation.

Madam Speaker, I would hope that the temptation to engage in petty politics would be put aside for this sound piece of legislation this afternoon.

JAMES SMITH WINS CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION FOR FIFTH DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

(Mr. CLEMENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEMENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor James Smith, winner of the Congressional Art Competition for the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee. James is a recent graduate of my alma mater, Hillsboro High School in Nashville, with his award-winning photograph entitled "Angels Come From Istanbul."

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to look at James' photograph, along with all of the other winning artwork that will be on display for the next year. It is important that we honor our artists for various reasons. By providing others with their art, artists contribute to an educational process that not only gives us an alternative form of communication, but also invokes thought and stimulates one's analytical skills.

Furthermore, artists are inventive and perceptive people who learn to express themselves in powerful, positive ways. For these reasons and countless more, I rise to congratulate and honor Mr. James Smith.

IRS RECORDS SHOW 340,000 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OR FEDERAL RETIREES HAVE FAILED TO PAY THEIR TAXES

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, the Scripps Howard News Service reported Sunday that IRS records show 340,000 Federal employees or Federal retirees have failed to pay their income taxes. 340,000, including, get this, almost 3,000 IRS employees. This information came from a report prepared by the government's own General Accounting Office.

Already we know from news reports that almost half of the tax advice that the IRS itself gives out is wrong. Now we discover from this GAO report that while the IRS comes after private citizens, it cannot clean its own house. Almost 3,000 IRS employees not paying their own taxes is scandalous. Federal ethics laws require Federal employees to pay their taxes as a condition of employment. These 3,000 IRS employees who have not paid their taxes should be ordered to pay immediately, or they should be fired.

But the best thing, Madam Speaker, we could do would be to tear up or burn the confusing, convoluted Tax Code we now have, come up with a new, simple system and do away with the IRS monster as we know it today.

HOUSE NEEDS TO ENSURE VETERANS GET WHAT THEY DESERVE

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, today I rise because we have a major bill before us, H.R. 1291, that will talk about the Montgomery GI bill; but I want to take this opportunity to discuss the process.

Madam Speaker, I am concerned that as people learn about the political process and how it is supposed to operate, here is a bill on the House floor today that is very important, yet it

never saw the light in terms of subcommittee. It never had the opportunity of being heard in full committee. It never had the opportunity so that we could provide some amendments.

In fact, I presumed that when the leadership heard we had some amendments to try to improve the bill, they chose to bring it on the House floor without the process that this body has allowed through the ages to allow an opportunity for us to be able to influence. It is unfortunate. It is a good bill; yet we need to understand that we need to improve this bill.

Madam Speaker, tuition rates throughout this country have risen. The studies show that even the fees in a lot of universities are higher. We need to make sure that our veterans get what they deserve, not only a process but a service.

□ 1415

THE PRICE OF GAS

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I am outraged. I am outraged that Americans are paying in some places in Indiana upwards to \$2 a gallon for gasoline. Families across this country are being hurt by the fluctuating cost of fueling their cars. Stopping at the pump is no longer a routine function.

We have heard of sticker shock, Madam Speaker. Now we have been introduced this summer to pump sticker shock.

For years our colleagues in the other party have been actively working against opening new refineries and other methods of increasing the domestic supply of oil and gasoline. They have tried to demonize the oil industry of late and place the blame for rising costs squarely on the shoulders of executives and CEOs. Their political ploys have cost American drivers millions at the pump and have increased our reliance on foreign oil to such an extent that 60 percent of our oil comes from abroad.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to say that our President is leading on increased energy independence and the Republican majority in this body stands with him to end the day of pump shock in this summer and in the months ahead for American families.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED REGARDING OUT-OF-STATE WASTE

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to note the recent decision of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals upholding the

district court opinion that Virginia cannot limit out-of-State waste coming into its borders because such restrictions violate the Commerce Clause of the Constitution. This court decision makes the necessity of Congress passing interstate waste legislation all the more urgent and compelling.

With the determination of the courts that State regulation of the interstate hauling of garbage violates the Commerce Clause, it is now time for Congress to specifically empower States to curb the amount of trash coming into landfills from outside the State.

The natural beauty of Virginia should not be degraded by out-of-State trash so that out-of-State haulers and trucking companies can reap benefits. Virginians have spoken on this issue and legislation was consequently passed and signed by the Governor that restricted the entrance of interstate waste into the Commonwealth, but then was struck down by the Federal courts.

Congress needs to act now to return this issue back to the States where the voices of the people can be heard.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Without objection, and pursuant to section 303(a) of Public Law 106-286, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. BEREUTER, Nebraska, cochairman;

Mr. LEACH, Iowa;
Mr. DREIER, California;
Mr. WOLF, Virginia;
Mr. PITTS, Pennsylvania.
There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

21ST CENTURY MONTGOMERY GI BILL ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1291) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of educational benefits for veterans under the Montgomery GI Bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1291

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancement Act".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF BASIC EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE UNDER MONTGOMERY GI BILL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 3015(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) for an approved program of education pursued on a full-time basis, at the monthly rate of—

"(A) for months occurring during fiscal year 2002, \$800,

"(B) for months occurring during fiscal year 2003, \$950,

"(C) for months occurring during fiscal year 2004, \$1,100, and

"(D) for months occurring during a subsequent fiscal year, the amount for months occurring during the previous fiscal year increased under subsection (h); or".

(2) Section 3015(b)(1) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(1) for an approved program of education pursued on a full-time basis, at the monthly rate of—

"(A) for months occurring during fiscal year 2002, \$650,

"(B) for months occurring during fiscal year 2003, \$772,

"(C) for months occurring during fiscal year 2004, \$894, and

"(D) for months occurring during a subsequent fiscal year, the amount for months occurring during the previous fiscal year increased under subsection (h); or".

(b) CPI ADJUSTMENT.—No adjustment in rates of educational assistance shall be made under section 3015(h) of title 38, United States Code, for fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today the House of Representatives has an historic opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to veterans, promote higher education, boost military recruitment and retention and strengthen the ladder of opportunity by passing H.R. 1291, the 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancement Act.

This legislation, which I introduced on March 29 with 57 cosponsors, including my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), now has over 100 cosponsors and is supported by almost two dozen veterans service, military and higher education organizations as well as Secretary of Veterans Affairs Anthony Principi. The bill responds to the rising costs of college education by providing a 70 percent increase in total benefits to eligible veterans in less than 3 years.

Not since the enactment of the Montgomery GI Bill in 1985 have we had the opportunity to vote for such a dramatic increase in veterans educational

benefits. I hope that all of my colleagues will support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, since the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly called the GI Bill, we have continuously provided educational support for our Nation's veterans. The original GI Bill is universally recognized as one of the most successful pieces of legislation ever approved by the Congress.

In the decade following World War II, more than 2 million eligible men and women went to college using these educational benefits. The result was an American workforce enriched by 450,000 engineers, 238,000 teachers, 91,000 scientists, 67,000 doctors, 22,000 dentists, and another million college-educated men and women. It is estimated that another 5 million men and women received other schooling or job training using the GI Bill. All told, approximately 7.8 million men and women were educated or trained by the GI Bill, helping to create what we know as the modern middle class.

The original GI Bill exceeded all expectations and had enormous benefits beyond the immediate benefits given to our deserving war veterans. College enrollment grew dramatically. In 1947, GI Bill enrollees accounted for almost half of all the total college population, resulting in the need for more and larger colleges and universities. In my home State of New Jersey, for example, Rutgers University saw its admissions grow from a pre-war high of 7,000 to almost 16,000.

A Veterans' Administration study in 1965, Madam Speaker, showed that due to the increased earning power of GI Bill college graduates, Federal Government income tax revenues rose by more than \$1 billion annually. And in less than 20 years, the \$14 billion cost of the original program had been recouped.

Madam Speaker, there is widespread agreement on the effect and effectiveness of veterans' educational programs. Building upon the success of the GI Bill, Congress approved a second bill, the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, during the Korean War; then a third bill, the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, during the Vietnam War; and a fourth bill, the Veterans Educational Assistance Act, for the post-Vietnam War era.

Finally, in 1985, Congress approved today's Montgomery GI Bill, or MGIB, which was designed not only to help veterans make a transition into the workforce through additional education and training, but also to support the concept of an all-volunteer Armed Forces. The use of educational benefits as a recruitment tool has been one of the most spectacularly successful of all the tools given to our Nation's military recruiters.

However, Madam Speaker, as we all know, the skyrocketing costs of a college education have seriously eroded the buying power of the MGIB benefits. The Congressional Research Service

stated in its testimony to the committee, and I want to thank our distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Benefits, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), for the two outstanding hearings that he chaired, that between academic years 1980-1981 and 2000-2001, average tuition and fees at 4-year public and 2-year public colleges rose 336 percent. For private colleges it rose by 352 percent.

Under current law, a full-time veteran student receives \$650 monthly under the Montgomery GI Bill from which the veteran student pays tuition, books, supplies, fees and subsistence allowance, including housing, food and transportation. However, according to data furnished by the College Board, the current \$650 per month would have to be raised to \$1,025 for a veteran student to attend a 4-year public college as a commuter student at an average cost of \$9,229 per year.

That is just what our legislation does, I say to my colleagues. H.R. 1291 increases the \$650 monthly amount to \$800 per month effective this October 1, then to \$950 per month effective October 1, 2002, and then finally to \$1,100 per month effective October 1, 2003. This represents a 70 percent increase in the monthly educational benefit in 3 years. As we point out in this chart, it goes from \$23,400 to \$39,600 after being fully phased in.

Madam Speaker, in this era of investing our scarce resources in areas that produce positive results, let me briefly share with my colleagues what the effect of this bill will be. At the moment, there are 266,000 veterans who are enrolled in school under the Montgomery GI Bill. This is anticipated to increase to about 330,000 over the next 10 years. However, with the approval of our legislation, the number of veteran students in school under the MGIB will increase to about 375,000 in 2011, an increase of 45,000 over the current estimate. And each of these students will be positioned, we believe, to obtain a better job and make more money, thus repaying many times over our Nation's investment in them under the MGI Bill.

Let me also point out to my colleagues that there will also be an ancillary impact on utilization. We know that something on the order of 50 percent of the people who are eligible are using this benefit. It just has not been enough to make the difference. This, we believe, will boost that participation.

Let me also say, Madam Speaker, that this bill is indeed a starting point. It is not an ending point. Our committee report on the Budget for fiscal year 2002 says that the ultimate goal is a Montgomery GI Bill that pays tuition, fees and a monthly subsistence allowance, thus allowing veterans to pursue enrollment in any educational institution in America limited only by their own aspirations, abilities and initiative.

However, after looking at the history of the program, our committee report

on the fiscal year 2002 budget also states that we need to take major steps now, no delay, to increase the benefit for today's veterans who are currently eligible for the program. On a bipartisan basis, Members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs agreed that a graduated increase in the current monthly benefit was the most important step we could take over the next 3 years to encourage veterans to use the benefit they had earned by faithful service to our Nation. For the first time in anyone's memory, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget accepted our committee recommendation and included the necessary funds in the budget resolution. He also fought to keep those funds in the conference report. As a result, we are able to bring to this floor a bill that is in compliance with the Budget Act.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1291 is good news for veterans. It is good for education. It is good for our military and our national defense. And it is good for our economy. H.R. 1291 is good public policy. I sincerely hope that all of our Members will support it.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I must, regrettably, comment on the process that brought us here today. Since I first entered the House in 1981, I have had the honor to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, first as a Member, later as Vice Chairman and now as Chairman. During these twenty-one years, I had the privilege of serving for 14 years with Chairman Sonny Montgomery, the Montgomery GI Bill's namesake, as well as for 6 years with Chairman BOB STUMP, now the Armed Services Committee Chairman. During all these years, the Veterans' Affairs Committee operated on a bipartisan basis with one simple goal: to help improve the lives of our nation's veterans.

During the five and half months I have served as Chairman, we have sought to continue this tradition and operate on a bipartisan basis. I was gratified when the Committee approved in a unanimous vote—let me emphasize that—a unanimous vote, the Views and Estimates Report for the Budget Committee. It was in large part due to our bipartisan approach—doing what was right for our veterans, not for our parties or our political careers—that we were successful in seeing a 12 percent increase for veterans spending in this year's budget.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1291, the legislation we are considering today, resulted from a lot of hard work by the Members and staff of the Veterans' Affairs Committee—Republicans and Democrats—over many, many months. This legislation offers a realistic yet substantial increase—a 70 percent increase—in the amount of money available to veterans for educational benefits.

Madam Speaker, it was with some sadness last week that I learned that the Democrats on the Committee, having already agreed to our bipartisan strategy for moving H.R. 1291, reversed course and decided instead to take a political course. Their ploy to offer an amendment raising the cost of the program from \$9 billion over ten years to more than \$23 billion over ten years may appear alluring to some, but is not paid for in the budget resolution and ultimately it is unsustainable and would stand no chance of becoming law.

Madam Speaker, I understand that some members would like to see an even larger increase in educational benefits for veterans than the 70 percent increase that my legislation offers—frankly I would like to get to the point where we can offer a full tuition and expenses GI bill—but we are not yet there.

That's why the Committee, on a bipartisan basis, had made the decision to move quickly to pass H.R. 1291 with its 70 percent increase, get it signed into law, and then see what could be done next.

That's why on March 27, when we held our bipartisan press conference introducing H.R. 1291, Mr. Evans himself said:

"I view the Smith-Evans legislation that will soon be introduced as the next interim step toward the Committee's final goal of providing our veterans with the full costs of getting educated."

That's why on May 24, Mr. REYES, the Ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Benefits said:

"H.R. 1291 . . . represents a step in the right direction toward ensuring that these opportunities for our veterans remain real and truly meaningful opportunities for all.

"While I think everyone wishes it could do more, H.R. 1291 would indeed go far toward fulfilling our collective goals. And I am proud to be a cosponsor of this very important and vital legislation."

Madam Speaker, I said at the outset that today can be an historic day for our nation's veterans. We have an opportunity to continue our longstanding tradition of supporting our veterans in a bipartisan manner.

Let's do what is right for our veterans. Let's make real progress, not just speeches. Let's agree to work together, on a bipartisan basis, without rancor or ill-will, to join together to ensure that we do right for those who have done right for us.

Let's pass this historic legislation which will result in a dramatic increase in GI educational benefits—a 70 percent increase. In 1944, during consideration of the original GI Bill, the Senate voted 50 to nothing for approval and the House followed suit, voting 387 to 0 in favor of this historic legislation. I hope we can do the same today.

Madam Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to join me today in voting unanimously to approve H.R. 1291, and renew our commitment to the men and women who are on the front lines promoting freedom and peace all over the world.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. REYES, Chairman and

Ranking Member of the Benefits Subcommittee, for their hard work on this bill.

I also want to thank Ranking Member EVANS for his continuous efforts on behalf of our servicemembers and veterans.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancement Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. EVANS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote for this measure. This legislation provides an increase which is moderate but it is important in veterans' educational benefits.

I want to salute the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman. He has worked together with me in the past. I look forward to a good relationship in the future. He got that budgetary increase. We are quite proud of his hard work in that regard. We have some differences on this issue today, but they are honest differences.

I regret that no member of the Subcommittee on Benefits or the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been given the opportunity to vote on this measure or alternative legislation. Ironically, while this measure will improve educational benefits for men and women in uniform who serve to protect and defend our freedoms and liberties, members have been stripped of their right to vote in committee.

□ 1430

Not only have Members been disenfranchised, so too have the men and women who elected them to represent them in office here in the Congress.

After days of hearings of testimony from more than two dozen witnesses, there was no debate and there was no vote on this measure or any other proposal. This, I believe, is a sad commentary.

It will be said that this measure provides a major increase in the educational benefits for veterans; but while that is true, we could do much more.

It has been said that this legislation is a partial step. That is an acknowledgment that the benefits provided by the legislation are insufficient. Years from now, a future Congress may enact legislation providing veterans a truly meaningful educational benefit. There is no time at this point to wait, however. That meaningful veterans education benefit could be provided now. I am forced to conclude the leadership of this Congress is too timid and not willing to undertake that important step.

It may be said that it costs too much to provide our servicemen and women an educational benefit worthy of their service. I understand the budgetary surplus of the next 10 years is expected to be \$500 billion. It is not a question about the budget. It is a question about our priorities.

The importance of a meaningful veterans educational benefit is well understood. The educational opportunities veterans had during World War II fundamentally changed our Nation for the better, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has pointed out.

Military service today is no less worthy. I regret that this measure provides inadequate benefits. I regret committee members are not given the opportunity to do their job. I regret that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the ranking Democrat member of the Subcommittee on Benefits, will be unable to participate in this debate because of the circumstances by which this measure was brought to the floor.

Nonetheless, I urge my colleagues to support this measure. I salute the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and his staff for their hard work; but our veterans, I believe, deserve the help that they get from the Federal Government, and we must do more to make this a meaningful piece of legislation.

VA BENEFITS AS PERCENT OF ANNUAL HIGHER EDUCATION COSTS¹

	Percentage of cost covered in fiscal year—						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
H.R. 1291	33	32	32	31	31	30	30
Evans amendment	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Current law	20	20	19	19	19	19	18

¹ Combined cost of tuition, fees, books, and supplies based on data provided by The College Board, plus annual stipend of \$7,200 for living expenses.

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Average tuition + fees	\$9,921	\$10,418	\$10,939	\$11,486	\$12,060	\$12,663	\$13,296	\$13,961	\$14,659	\$15,392
Average books + supplies	717	753	791	831	873	916	962	1,010	1,061	1,114
Subtotal ¹	10,638	11,171	11,730	12,317	12,933	13,579	14,258	14,971	15,720	16,506
Living stipend ²	7,200	7,380	7,565	7,754	7,948	8,146	8,350	8,558	8,772	8,992
Average annual cost	17,838	18,551	19,295	20,071	20,881	21,725	22,608	23,529	24,492	25,498
Average annual benefit under current law ³	3,680	3,785	3,889	3,998	4,087	4,192	4,297	4,407	4,517	4,633
Percentage covered	21%	20%	20%	20%	20%	19%	19%	19%	18%	18%
Average annual benefit under HR 1291 ⁴	\$4,485	\$5,372	\$6,364	\$6,525	\$6,687	\$6,855	\$7,029	\$7,202	\$7,382	\$7,567
Percentage covered	25%	29%	33%	33%	32%	32%	31%	31%	30%	30%
Average annual benefit under HR 320	\$3,680	\$3,785	\$3,889	\$20,071	\$20,881	\$21,725	\$22,608	\$23,529	\$24,492	\$25,498
Percentage covered	21%	20%	20%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

¹ Assumes inflation of 2.5% over CPIU, or 5% (CBO).

² Assumes 2.5% COLA (CBO).

³ Assumes 2.5% COLA (CBO).

⁴ Assumes 2.5% COLA after FY 2004.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gen-

tleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Benefits.

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to come to the well of this House to speak in strong support of this legislation.

At this point, Madam Speaker, it is also important that I respond to some of the observations of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), my friend and the ranking member.

I think it is important to point out to this House that when the Committee on Veterans' Affairs met earlier this year to consider what our veterans budget should be, it decided unanimously to request funds to increase the Montgomery GI bill to \$1,100 over 3 years. It also talked about the desirability of ultimately changing the program so that veterans would be entitled to a monthly stipend, as well as government reimbursement of tuition and fees, at any postsecondary institution in the United States.

However, the committee did not ask that funds for this program change be included in the budget resolution. Indeed, the committee explicitly stated that it would not seek funding for such a change until after a bill like this one we are bringing to the floor today had been enacted into law. Not only did the Democratic substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) contain funds to go beyond what was requested by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, it also should be noted that although the Blue Dog Democrat budget substitute contained increased amounts specifically to fund H.R. 320, my good friend, the ranking member from Illinois, voted against that proposal.

Madam Speaker, the bottom line on the legislation today is this: rather than being prisoners of process, we have a chance to enact sound policy, a 70, 7-0, a 70 percent increase in benefits under the Montgomery GI bill over the next 3 years. That is something that is meaningful for today's veterans. That is why I rise in strong support of this legislation.

We should note this bill was introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). It is cosponsored by 105 Members of this body, including as original cosponsors the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY); the dean of all House Members, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL); the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON); and the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and the dean of our Arizona delegation, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP).

As my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, said, this measure increases the bill, again, we cannot state it enough, by 70 percent over the next 3 fiscal years, the most substantial increase to date.

There is no disputing the fact that the current Montgomery GI bill needs

improvement as a transition tool from military to civilian life. At present, it pays \$650 per month, from which the veteran must pay for tuition, books, fees, housing, transportation, and myriad other personal expenses that students incur while attending college.

Sixty-eight percent of veterans are married at the time of separation from the military and many of those vets have children. These vets are presented with even further expenses while trying to obtain higher education.

I would note that from 1987 through 1997, VA reported that only 37 percent of eligible veterans used the Montgomery GI bill. In comparison, almost 64 percent of Vietnam-era GIs used their education benefits during the first 10 years of the program.

Providing for the common defense was the primary reason for establishing our constitutional Republic. Therefore, military service is our Nation's most fundamental form of national service. Today's servicemember is no less valued than those who were conscripted. Service personnel and veterans represent an untapped opportunity for the Nation, as Mr. G. Kim Wincup, vice chairman of the Transition Commission, stated in his testimony before our Subcommittee on Benefits.

We as a Nation benefit from highly educated veterans. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, testified before our subcommittee that, quoting now, "providing our veterans with educational assistance creates a more highly educated, productive workforce, that spurs the economy while rewarding the dedication and great sacrifices made by members of our military."

Madam Speaker, I would suggest this bill is not just about greater purchasing power under the Montgomery GI bill. It is about the value we place on our military volunteers, persons who are in fact not drafted into the military but who as a Nation have asked to serve voluntarily, military veterans who are indeed a unique national resource.

These are individuals who after they conclude their military service will ultimately use this GI bill not only to catch up with their nonveteran peers but also to serve among America's leaders.

I would applaud the chairman for his leadership on this bill. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation. What part of a 70 percent increase do my colleagues fail to understand?

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1291, the 21st Century Mont-

gomery GI Bill Enhancement Act. As a co-sponsor of the bill, I urge its passage. This legislation continues our efforts to improve the education program for our men and women in uniform. The bill provides an increase in benefits, including raising the monthly educational stipend to \$800 a month for fiscal year 2002, to \$1,100 by fiscal year 2004.

I remember well the beginnings of what was later known to be the Montgomery GI bill. It was shared between the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the House Committee on Armed Services, and I remember playing a part in making sure that it reached the floor at that time.

The gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable Sonny Montgomery, was the author, is the author; and we should remember his efforts as we improve on that bill today.

This legislation is the right step toward enhancing this bill for our veterans. We must continue to take advantage of opportunities to provide our veterans a truly meaningful and substantial educational program.

Full funding for tuition and fees and a monthly stipend for living expenses in exchange for a service commitment would dramatically improve the GI program and would bring parity with other scholarship and tuition assistance programs currently available to young Americans. Efforts by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) to build upon improvements under the Montgomery GI bill will greatly improve this education program for our men and women in uniform, and I hope that his efforts on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will continue and that they will be able to pass additional educational benefits, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) so desires.

Now while it is important that the House consider this legislation, the process by which it is brought to the floor concerns me. It is deeply disturbing that no member of the Subcommittee on Benefits or of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been given the opportunity to engage in a full and open debate on this measure or vote on the bill before today.

I hope procedural abuses like this do not occur again, because it is not fair, either to the Members of this body or to the veterans for whom it is intended to benefit.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Madam Speaker, as one of the veterans who took advantage of the GI bill after I got out of the Marine Corps, in fact to the tune of 45 months, or 2 years of undergraduate and 3 years of medical school, like all Members of this House I care about the GI bill, and that is why I find this process in which those of us who serve on

the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was an unfortunate one in which this bill did not come before the committee to be considered and voted on.

What are my concerns? Well, in 1999, Anthony Principi, who is now Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and this was before he was Secretary of Veterans Affairs, chaired a commission known as the Principi Commission. The formal title was "Report of the Congressional Commission on Service Members and Veterans Transition Assistance."

Basically, what this report called for was a return to an education benefit for our veterans, much more like the original GI bill right after World War II.

Now what is the problem? What is the difference between what the Principi Commission called for and the legislation we are considering today? The average budget last year for 4 years for tuition and fees only was about \$3,500. If we add in the costs, living expenses for a student, that gets to about \$12,000.

The average private college tuition for a 4-year college was about \$16,300 last year. That does not include any living expenses. That is just tuition and fees.

It does not take a whole lot of math to figure out that 3 years from now, when the bill we are considering today is in full effect, the maximum benefit annually will be \$13,200; \$3,000 short of just the tuition and fees with nothing provided for living expenses.

So in my view what we have done, Madam Speaker, is missed an opportunity to increase opportunity for our veterans; to help our military recruiters; to help our colleges; and perhaps, most important of all, to help the students at all of our colleges, even our very expensive 4-year private colleges, who would benefit by sitting next to a 4-year veteran of the military.

We will all vote for this bill, Madam Speaker; but it could have been so much better.

Let me make some response to the comments earlier that somehow we were engaging in petty politics. It is not petty politics to want to improve this bill or any bill. It is not petty politics to want bills to go through committee. It is certainly not petty politics to be in agreement with the current Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Anthony Principi, who put out this very important report; and the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) that he wanted to bring up in committee merely reflects the desires of the Principi Commission.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS).

Mr. SIMMONS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1291. This bipartisan bill greatly increases the Montgomery GI bill as a recruitment tool for our military services. Based on recent testimony provided to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs by the col-

lege board, the monthly benefit needed to meet current average costs for a 4-year college is \$1,025. Yet the current GI bill benefit is only \$650.

Madam Speaker, \$650 per month is just not enough. As a consequence, America's youth and their families no longer see military service as a path to education. They see it as a detour away from their college plans.

□ 1445

As a Vietnam veteran and somebody who spent 30 years in the Reserves, I know that quality personnel are the backbone and the brains of our military, and one way to attract quality personnel is to provide an enhanced education benefit.

If my colleagues believe as I do that an improved education benefit is going to serve as an enlistment tool and is also going to provide for an educated citizenry, then support this bill. Let us help our young citizens, let us help our military, let us help America. Vote for this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1291, the 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancement Act, and I commend Chairman SMITH and subcommittee Chairman HAYWORTH for their leadership in introducing the bill we are considering this afternoon.

This bipartisan bill greatly improves the Montgomery GI Bill as a recruitment tool for our military services.

Based on recent testimony provided to the Veterans' Affairs Committee by the College Board, the monthly benefit needed to meet the current average cost for a four-year college is \$1,025. Yet the current GI Bill benefit is only \$650 per month.

Madam Speaker, \$650 per month is just not enough. As a consequence, America's youth and their families no longer see military service as the path to education; they see it as a detour away from their college plans. This, in turn, makes it more difficult to recruit young high school graduates into the services.

As a Vietnam veteran, and as someone who has spent 30 years in the U.S. Army Reserve, I know that quality personnel are the backbone and the brains of our military. One way to attract quality personnel into the military is to provide an enhanced education benefit through the GI Bill; and H.R. 1291 does just this.

Under the provisions of this legislation, the monthly educational benefit for someone who commits to a standard three-year enlistment will go from \$800 in October of this year; to \$950 in October 2002; to \$1,100 on October 1, 2003.

A two-year enlistment with a four-year commitment to the Reserves also carries an improved benefit.

Testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Committee shows that the majority of recruits, across all branches of service, list money for education as their primary reason for enlistment. It is clear that an increase in that money would provide a greater incentive for high school graduates to join the military.

On May 24th of this year, the personnel chiefs from all of our military services testified that H.R. 1291's enhancements to the Montgomery GI Bill would be "very effective" as a recruitment and retention tool.

If my colleagues believe, as I do, that an improved education benefit will not only serve as an enlistment tool, but will also provide a more educated citizenry, then I urge them to join me in supporting this bill.

Let's help our young citizens. Let's help the military. Let's help America! Let's pass this bill.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, I am proud to be here today and be a cosponsor of H.R. 1291, the 21st Century GI Bill Enhancement Act. At a time when drastic tax cuts have overshadowed our Nation's priorities, it is refreshing that the House should take up the legislation that takes a major step towards restoring purchasing power for the GI Bill.

Educational benefits are the military's best recruiting tool. The Montgomery GI Bill must be modernized to meet today's demands. H.R. 1291 moves toward this goal of expanding access to higher education by increasing the current monthly benefits from \$650 to \$800 by the year 2002, and ultimately to \$1,100 by 2004.

Clearly, today's legislation provides a stronger education package to the men and women who choose to serve our country.

However, while I support this measure, I regret that I did not have the opportunity to vote for the bill in full committee because of the manner in which H.R. 1291 was brought to the House floor.

More importantly, I am disappointed that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking member, was not permitted to offer his amendment during the subcommittee markup on H.R. 1291, which was abruptly canceled.

H.R. 320, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the Montgomery GI Bill Improvements Act, would have provided additional resources for tuition, would have provided additional resources for fees, would have provided additional resources for books and supplies, as well as provided assistance and allowances for these people that would have enlisted for 4 additional years in service. As drafted and presented today on the House floor, H.R. 1291 only provides modest assistance in covering this cost.

Yes, we are happy that this is here. We would have had a great opportunity to make some things happen, and it is unfortunate we did not have the opportunity to make that happen.

My understanding is, based on the rules that we operate under, Rule 4(c)(1), the committee rule states that each subcommittee is authorized to meet and report to the full committee on all matters under its jurisdiction.

These committees were not allowed to practice the way we should, and it is something that we also need to recognize, that this is not a way of handling our issues that come before the House.

As we look in terms of the resources that we have now and the costs of higher education, recent reports show that

fees alone are higher than tuition in most universities around the country, so there is a real need for us to look at this seriously.

We can stand here today and be proud of this piece of legislation, but we can also not feel proud of the way it was handled. Why, why, did this particular piece of legislation not have an opportunity to have a vote?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this legislation, I am proud to stand here and urge its passage, because I think it improves one of the most popular and important benefits that the military offers today, the GI Bill.

When it started after World War II, as you know, it really changed the way we look at higher education in America, because it took the college education opportunity and experience and changed it from kind of an elite opportunity for a privileged few to something that everybody could enjoy. All Americans could enjoy that. It became the fulfillment of the American dream, and became something that we could look forward to. It became a way that a grateful Nation could say thank you and pay back those patriots that marched into harm's way to change this world.

But it got expensive to provide education, and it was hard to keep up. Yet this legislation does just that. We have heard it increases those benefits by 70 percent, and that is important, but it also should be emphasized that every dollar we spend is a good investment, because every time we spend a dollar helping some young man or woman get an education, it returns back into our economy. It is estimated in a two-year degree, that a dollar spend comes back seventeen-fold. In a four-year degree, it comes back fourteen-fold.

I encourage everyone to support the passage of this. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) for introducing this legislation and for his leadership. I pledge my commitment to make it even better. I urge everyone to pass this legislation.

Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this truly landmark legislation, I rise in strong support of the 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancement Act. This legislation will vastly improve one of the most popular and important benefits our military provides—the All Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program, or the Montgomery GI Bill.

This important program serves two main purposes:

- (1) It is a key recruitment and retention tool for our military, and
- (2) It helps servicemembers transition into civilian life and apply the skills they learned in uniform in the larger society.

The program has a broad and overwhelmingly positive impact on society. Servicemembers with college degrees or additional skills and training—as with any individ-

uals who attain higher degrees—are more likely to be able to support themselves and their families through steady employment, and less likely to require government assistance.

Furthermore, according to a study done for the VA by the Klemm Analysis Group last year, servicemembers who gain college education or additional skills and training using the Montgomery GI Bill contribute more to our economy than servicemembers who do not take advantage of this program. They are able to get higher paying jobs, buy more goods and services, and invest at higher levels. In fact, the Klemm study indicates that for every dollar the government spends on the Montgomery GI Bill for servicemembers who use these benefits to get a four-year degree, as much as \$14 is returned to the economy. For servicemembers who use the benefits to get a two-year degree, as much as \$17 is returned to the economy.

Regrettably, too few servicemembers take advantage of this benefit because it has failed to keep pace with the skyrocketing costs of higher education. The current benefits under the Montgomery GI Bill cover just 63% of the average cost of a baccalaureate degree for a commuter student at a state college with no other expenses. And, it is rare that the servicemember taking advantage of his GI Bill benefits has no other expenses. In fact, more than two-thirds of all veterans are married at separation from the military, and many have children.

The 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancement Act provides the most significant increase—an increase of nearly 70% from the current benefit of \$650 per month to the fully implemented benefit of \$1,100 per month in 2004—in this program's 16-year history. According to the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities during testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Benefits earlier this month, this \$1,100 benefit "would cover the full tuition charges at many four year public institutions, and even at a substantial number of private colleges."

There is little doubt that the original GI Bill benefits, which paid the full costs for a higher education, were tremendously successful both as a recruitment and retention tool, and as a bridge from military to civilian life. That program helped veterans returning home from World War II transition smoothly into civilian life, and our nation was all the better for it. It is estimated that every dollar invested in the GI Bill brought between \$5 and \$12.50 back into the economy in the form of higher wage-paying jobs and increased purchases of goods and services. These patriots bore the weight of the building of a new America. They first saved the nation from tyranny and then helped the nation to rise to the responsibilities of world leadership with the help of the GI Bill.

H.R. 1291 does not restore the Montgomery GI Bill to the high standards of its predecessor. It would be enormously difficult to keep up the pace of increases in the costs of higher education. In the past twenty years, the average tuition and fees at 4-year private colleges rose by 352%. During that same period, the costs at 4- and 2-year public colleges rose by 336%. But, while H.R. 1291 may not be all that we want it to be, it does make significant progress. It will enable many more servicemembers to take advantage of this great tool for advancing their hopes and improving their prospects for the future.

There are other bills that would make bigger leaps in shorter time. But the fact of the matter is that it is the bill before us that is fully funded in the budget resolution passed by this house. It is not a responsible course of government to make promises that cannot be kept. Over time, given the commitment of our Veterans' Affairs Chairman CHRIS SMITH and others on the committee and in this body, we may very well get a benefit comparable to the promise of the original GI Bill. But, in the meantime, as Carl Sagan once said, "It's better to light a candle than to curse the darkness."

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman CHRIS SMITH for introducing this legislation, and pledge my commitment to continuing to work with him for further improvements in these important education benefits. I encourage my colleagues to make that pledge with me. With that, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey, the distinguished chairman of our committee, for bringing this measure to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, the GI Enhancement Act, and urge my colleagues to join in lending their support. This bill provides education benefits to veterans to a level more in line with today's increasingly expensive higher education opportunities by raising the current monthly Montgomery GI Bill rates.

Madam Speaker, this GI Bill is the most profound and far-reaching piece of legislation enacted by the Congress in the 20th century. The program, first implemented after World War II, single-handedly afforded college education to the millions of middle and working class men and women who served during the war, and it helped transform America in the postwar years, leading to the "baby-boom" and the rise of middle class suburbia.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this worthy, timely legislation. With prices rising three times faster than the Consumer Price Index, I can think of no better way to enhance the education benefits that we provide for those who serve in our Armed Forces.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING).

Mr. PICKERING. Madam Speaker, I rise with great pride to support H.R. 1291, the 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill. It is a great honor for me to follow G.V. Sonny Montgomery, who represented the Third District of Mississippi, the legislation which bears his

name and which is an embodiment of his commitment and his legacy to our Nation's Armed Services, the military, and to our veterans.

What does it mean for Mississippi? In the Third District we have 4,763 members of the Army-Air Force National Guard throughout the district; 1,410 active duty Air Force at Columbus Air Force Base; 1,646 active duty Navy and Marine Corps personnel at Meridian, Mississippi.

It means that they will have the opportunity to get an education, to better their lives, to have a higher standard of living and quality of life for their children and for their families.

At Mississippi State University, if they choose to attend there, today 55 percent of their tuition is covered. Under this legislation, 87 percent of their tuition and costs will be covered. One hundred twenty student veterans are now enrolled at the University of Southern Mississippi. Today, 51 percent of their costs of covered under this legislation. Three years from today, 83 percent of their costs will be covered. Four hundred sixty students are enrolled there today.

At the University of Mississippi, 55 percent of the costs are covered today. Eighty-seven percent will be covered in the future, and over 100 students will benefit.

Madam Speaker, it is time for the next generation to step up to the plate and follow the leaders of the World War II generation, to show our commitment to the Armed Services. For the men and women of the 21st century who are willing to commit to serve their country, we need to make sure we can recruit and retain and give them the educational opportunities and benefits of the Montgomery GI Bill. For that reason, I have great pride in supporting this good and noble effort.

Mr. LARGENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1291 and the opportunities it provides our veterans across the country. College tuition has risen approximately 49 percent over the last ten years, and more than 114 percent since 1980. This does not include costs which are incurred beyond tuition and fees. The Montgomery GI Bill benefits have not risen significantly during this time, causing hardship for our veterans who continue their education after their military service.

Many of our military personnel and veterans have families to consider, and it is of utmost importance to assist our veterans and their families who depend upon them. Veterans who continue their education often face burdens greater than the average student because they often live off campus and commute in an effort to provide the best possible situation for their families.

Our veterans serve their country with a strong sense of duty, courage and loyalty, and it is unfortunate that they have to worry about putting food on the table and about their future after military service. Our goal of recruiting high quality personnel into the Armed Forces and strengthening the ranks with personnel who make a career of serving our nation must be a top priority. Our veterans deserve the

best educational benefits we can offer. I believe H.R. 1291 raises benefits to a level fitting of our nation's defenders. I thank our nation's veterans for their hard work and dedication, and I thank my colleague, Representative CHRIS SMITH, for introducing this bill and for his leadership on veteran's issues.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1291, the 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancements Act. This measure will modernize one of the most important pieces of legislation of the Twentieth Century, the Montgomery GI Bill, which was passed in 1944. I am pleased that we finally have the chance to bring the GI Bill in line with the current costs of higher education.

When the GI Bill was first enacted, it provided the stimulus for thousands of Americans to go to college after serving their country in World War II. This was a fitting reward to what has come to be termed as "The Greatest Generation," allowing them to move beyond the places they came from and pursue the American Dream. The GI Bill has since allowed millions of young men and women who could not otherwise afford college to have their education paid for after serving their country.

Unfortunately, as time has passed, the costs of sending our men and women to college have escalated considerably, and increased funding for the GI Bill has not been enough to keep the benefit current with costs. The maximum benefit right now is only \$650 a month, which does not cover the cost of the average four-year state institution. As a result of letting inflation erode our commitment to our veterans, we have lost a powerful recruiting tool for bringing new people into our armed forces. It is past time for us to raise the amount of these benefits. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1291. It will link any future increase in the education benefit to the consumer price index so that inflation will no longer be an issue.

We owe this not only to our veterans, but to the millions of young men and women who will be looking to our military in the future as their best hope of obtaining a college degree. I ask that all my colleagues join me in wholeheartedly supporting this measure today.

Mr. SHOWS. Madam Speaker, I am so proud to be here, as a member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, to share my continued support for H.R. 1291 with my colleagues in Congress.

As a young man growing up in Mississippi, two great men—my father and Sonny Montgomery, indisputably inspired my life in public service and advocacy for veterans. The valiant service rendered by men like my father and Congressman Montgomery was not done for any personal reward, just for knowing they had done their part to keep America and democracy strong. And yet, our nation did right by them by enacting the 1944 GI Bill of Rights, one of the landmark pieces of legislation of the 20th Century. It transformed America by providing for the education of millions of World War II veterans, as well as thousands of veterans who followed in their selfless path.

We all know why we must act swiftly on the passage of this legislation for our veterans. Simply put, they have earned it and deserve it. Our servicemen and women accept lower pay and modest living conditions in the military—we must meet their commitment with a promise to invest in their future.

As a country that depends on the volunteer membership of our servicemen and women to defend our nation's ideals, we must provide competitive benefits for our veterans. Recruiting is increasingly difficult in a thriving economy. We can strengthen the retention of our trained soldiers, if we deliver appropriate benefits and support.

At the same time, it is critical that the current cost of higher education be reflected. The cost of higher education since the inception of the Montgomery GI Bill in 1985 has increased more than double the rate of increase in GI Bill benefits. During the 106th Congress, and again during this Congress I introduced H.R. 1280, the Veterans Higher Education Opportunities Act. This legislation would index education benefits annually to the Annual figure published by the College Board, adjusting for the cost of attending a public four-year university as a commuter student. This way of determining benefits has received tremendous support from the Partnership for Veterans Education, made up of 40 organizations of veterans, military members, and higher education officials, as well as Admiral Tracey, the Administration's representative from the Pentagon who testified before the House Veterans Affairs Benefits Subcommittee on May 24th.

I am disappointed that we are debating this bill under the Suspension of the rules, and that there is no opportunity to consider alternatives. My bill, H.R. 1280, more accurately reflects the mission of Representative Montgomery by providing the level of education benefits that was promised to our soldiers when they entered the service. I support H.R. 1291, Madam Speaker, but we can do better. We are shortchanging our veterans by refusing to open the floor for honest debate.

Our nation's veterans are our heroes. They have shaped and sustained our nation with courage, sacrifice and faith. They have earned our respect and deserve our gratitude. Let us join together and do something meaningful by passing legislation to modernize and improve the Montgomery GI bill. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1291, the "21st Century" Montgomery G.I. Bill. This legislation is indeed important to our nation's national security as well as the men and women who serve our nation selflessly in uniform. It is also a sensible, bipartisan bill that will better America. It is good policy. As a veteran and a former GI Bill beneficiary, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 1291.

However, Madam Speaker, I am troubled by my Republican colleagues' decision to subvert the process and bypass the committee system. Last week, the Veterans Subcommittee on Benefits was scheduled to markup H.R. 1291. However, this markup was cancelled after the Committee's Democratic staff informed their Republican counterparts that Mr. EVANS and REYES each intended to offer an amendment at the scheduled markup.

Mr. EVANS' amendment would, like H.R. 320, have boosted to H.R. 1291's benefit package to cover the full cost of tuition for every servicemember now and in the future. Mr. REYES' amendment would have indexed the MGIB benefit to educational inflation instead of using the CPI, thus preventing a future deterioration in the real value of the MGIB.

Why did the Republicans block debate on these amendments? Why did Republican staff,

after being informed of Mr. EVANS' and REYES' intentions two days prior to the markup—a clear demonstration of good faith—attempt to browbeat veterans' groups into preventing a full debate on H.R. 1291 that would have improved this legislation? Both amendments, after all, would only benefit our veterans, servicemembers, and their families. They were not “Democratic” amendments meant to derail the MGIB, but honest attempts to better the MGIB program.

I remain in support of H.R. 1291. When I testified in support of it on June 7, I emphasized this bill was a good interim step in our efforts to overhaul the MGIB to make it more in line with the World War II-era GI Bill. I stressed that H.R. 1291 was good policy and a step in the right direction, but was not as comprehensive as H.R. 320, which would essentially pay the full cost of tuition and grant a living allowance for every MGIB beneficiary. I urged passage of H.R. 1291 as a positive step in the process of passing H.R. 320, not as the end of the road. Short-circuiting the committee process by preventing Republican or Democratic members from perfecting this legislation is not in the interest of America's veterans. This bill should be about what best helps veterans, not over who get credit for helping veterans.

Madam Speaker, LANE EVANS and I have worked hard over the last three years to pass H.R. 320, which aims to bolster military recruiting and assist young men and women who choose to serve our nation in uniform. H.R. 1291 is a solid interim measure that will improve military recruiting and increase access to higher education for veterans. It is good policy for our country, and represents an important step in what must be a continuing process of improving the MGIB. I would urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1291 today, but also urge my Republican colleagues to commit themselves to working with us the remainder of this session to fully restoring the G.I. Bill's purchasing power by passing H.R. 320.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancement Act, I am pleased to see the House of Representatives taking this action today.

More than 21 million veterans have been able to get a college education with the help of the government since the original GI Bill in 1944. By the time the last American World War II veteran graduated in 1956 with the help of this program, the United States was richer by 450,000 engineers; 238,000 teachers; 91,000 scientists; 67,000 doctors; 22,000 dentists; and more than a million other college-trained men and women. It was a landmark idea that paid off for our nation, and helped to catapult the United States into its position of post-war prominence.

Today, by updating the Montgomery GI Bill, we are taking a step that will help many more men and women achieve the goal of a college degree and a brighter future for themselves.

This bill will implement a historic funding increase in the Montgomery GI Bill education benefit. The legislation goes a long way toward closing the gap between current GI Bill benefit levels and the rising cost of a college education.

This legislation will increase the monthly education benefit from its current level of \$650 per month for 36 months to \$1,100—the larg-

est hike ever enacted. When fully phased in, the new education benefit will bring the total GI Bill benefit to \$39,600, an amount roughly equal to the estimated cost for a student at a four-year public college. Today, these benefit levels total only \$23,400, an amount that is far below what it takes to afford a degree in most institutions. The bill makes these increases over a three year period in responsible steps, increasing to \$800 the first year, the second year to \$950, and finally to \$1,100 per month in the third year.

As a Member of the House Budget Committee, I am pleased that the Budget Resolution our Committee constructed included provisions allowing for this much-needed benefit increase.

This is an important step to honor our veterans. Increasing benefit levels will also help to recruit young, talented people to our nation's armed forces. And, like the original GI Bill, it will help pay dividends for our nation, in college-educated young people who will go on to make contributions to their neighborhoods and our nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this legislation.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1291, the 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancement Act.

H.R. 1291 increases the amount of educational benefits available under the Montgomery GI Bill for an approved program of education on a full-time basis from the current monthly rate of \$650 for a minimum three-year enlistment to \$1,100 over three years.

The benefits for a two-year active enlistment and four years in the Reserves, currently \$528, will rise to \$894 over three years.

This legislation is truly important.

Over the last decade, benefits under the Montgomery GI Bill have not kept pace with the rising cost of a college education.

In fact, the Department of Veterans Affairs has indicated that roughly 50 percent of eligible veterans do not use the GI Bill education benefits that they are entitled to.

Veterans repeatedly cite the lack of buying power of the Montgomery GI Bill as one of the reasons for not using this benefit.

The bill will help hundreds of thousands of veterans, service members, and their families who take advantage of the Montgomery GI Bill.

Equally important, this bill will ultimately strengthen our national defense by helping to improve the military's recruiting efforts.

The original GI Bill of 1944 is widely regarded as one of the most important pieces of social legislation ever passed by Congress.

Like that original bill and its later versions, this bill makes higher education and training more affordable to military personnel returning to civilian life.

Again, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1291, the 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancement Act. I would like to thank my good friend and colleague, the Ranking Member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, LANE EVANS as well as Chairman CHRISTOPHER SMITH and Benefits Subcommittee Chairman J.D. HAYWORTH for their efforts to improve education benefits for our nation's veterans. I commend each of you for your leadership and your efforts toward improving the lives of America's veterans. How-

ever, as the Ranking Member on the Benefits Subcommittee, I am very disappointed that this matter was brought to the House Floor without Members of the Benefits Subcommittee or the Full Committee on Veterans' Affairs having an opportunity to debate and consider the measure in a mark-up.

Consistently, history has referred to GI Bill benefits as the most significant reason for the high educational attainment and post World War II economic leadership success of the United States. Through financial and tuition benefits, the GI Bill still provides millions of today's returning military service members the opportunity to gain important educational skills and knowledge they could not afford otherwise. With the cost of college climbing over the last two decades, and our nation's military plagued with recruitment problems, our obligation to our nation's veterans is to keep pace with these costs and provide stronger, more adequate GI Bill benefits. Increasing sources of private scholarships and funding, along with the Montgomery GI Bill's current inadequate level of benefits, has seriously hurt military recruiting efforts.

Our veterans certainly deserve better. From a national security standpoint, we cannot afford to allow our military to be without necessary manpower and strength. We must continue to work to maintain and improve the benefits for our veteran population. By doing this, we honor their service and provide for their future. As the Ranking Democratic Member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Benefits, I, along with my colleagues on the Subcommittee, held hearings on this legislation and heard testimony surrounding the significant issue of GI Bill enhancement. The testimony of individuals such as Representative JOHN DINGELL, himself an architect of GI Bill enhancement legislation, my colleague on the Committee Representative RONNIE SHOWS, and Secretary of Veterans' Affairs Anthony J. Principi, reflected a need to ensure that a GI Bill for the new century must provide a meaningful readjustment benefit to discharged service members while also giving our military an effective recruiting tool. We understand that there have been significant economic, societal, and military changes since the implementation of the GI Bill. These changes must be addressed, and Congress is now addressing its responsibility to make improvements to the structure and benefit level of this program.

It is unfortunate to mention, however, that this bill came to the floor of the House of Representatives without a mark-up. While this bill does much for American veterans and service members, many, including myself, wish it could do more. I intended to introduce an amendment to H.R. 1291 that would index the GI Bill to educational inflation rather than the Consumer Price Index. Indexing the GI Bill to the inflating cost of college tuition and expenses would allow veterans and beneficiaries of the GI Bill to receive full educational benefits without constant Congressional or governmental adjustment. The benefits would correspond with the significant costs of an institution of higher learning.

My colleague, Representative LANE EVANS, was going to introduce his bill, H.R. 320, as a substitute to H.R. 1291 during mark-up. H.R. 320, of which I am a co-sponsor, was designed to restore the GI Bill program to a benefit level comparable to that once provided to

veteran students after World War II. Essentially, H.R. 320 would pay for the full cost of attending college and would remove the large enrollment fee that is paid by service members. This legislation is modeled after the recommendations made by Secretary of Veterans' Affairs Anthony Principi when he was chairman for a Congressional Commission charged with studying the needs of military service members when they leave the military to return to civilian life. This legislation enjoys broad Congressional support and the support of several national veteran service organizations. Despite the absence of a mark-up or a chance for full Committee deliberation on this matter, the provisions within H.R. 320 and the amendment I intended to offer continue to enjoy strong support among Members of Congress and veteran service organizations. I, along with my colleagues, will continue to address this issue until all our veterans are finally given a fully functional, fully beneficial, fully enhanced GI Bill.

I am a supporter of H.R. 1291 because this measure does provide a considerable increase in veterans' educational benefits under the Montgomery GI Bill. Under H.R. 1291 the monthly benefit would increase to \$800 per month for fiscal year 2002, increasing to \$1,100 by fiscal year 2004. While I do believe that students and service members entering college in 2002 would benefit more from a bill that includes the amount of benefits that would be provided to veterans if the bill was adjusted to educational inflation, I encourage my colleagues to vote for the passage of this bill. It is the first step in a long road toward veterans' benefits enhancement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1291.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD COMBAT UNITS DEPLOYED IN SUPPORT OF ARMY OPERATIONS IN BOSNIA

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 154) honoring the continued commitment of the Army National Guard combat units deployed in support of Army operations in Bosnia, recognizing the sacrifices made by the members of those units while away from their jobs and families during those deployments, recognizing the important role of all National Guard and Reserve personnel at home and abroad to the national security of the United States, and ac-

knowledging, honoring, and expressing appreciation for the critical support by employers of the Guard and Reserve.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 154

Whereas in October 1999 the Army announced a groundbreaking multi-year plan to mobilize and deploy the headquarters of National Guard combat divisions to command the United States sector of the Multinational Stabilization Force in Bosnia and to employ significant elements of the Army National Guard enhanced combat brigades in that sector;

Whereas the 49th Armored Division, Texas Army National Guard, and Army National Guard combat units from the 30th Enhanced Separate Brigade of North Carolina and the 45th Enhanced Separate Brigade of Oklahoma have completed deployments in Bosnia, and 1,200 soldiers of the 48th Infantry Brigade of Georgia are as of June 2001 deployed to Bosnia in the largest such deployment of National Guard personnel in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization peacekeeping mission in Bosnia;

Whereas the more than 1,200,000 citizen-soldiers who comprise the National Guard and Reserve components of the Armed Forces nationwide commit significant time and effort in executing their important role in the Armed Forces;

Whereas these National Guard and Reserve citizen-soldiers serve a critical role as part of the mission of the Armed Forces to protect the freedom of United States citizens and the American ideals of justice, liberty, and freedom, both at home and abroad; and

Whereas thousands of employers nationwide continue their support for service of their employees in the Reserve components: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) honors the continuing service and commitment of the citizen-soldiers of the Army National Guard combat units deployed in support of Army operations in Bosnia;

(2) recognizes the deployment of the 48th Infantry Brigade in March 2001 as an important milestone in that commitment;

(3) honors the sacrifices made by the families and employers of the members of those units during their time away from home;

(4) expresses deep gratitude for the continuing support of civilian employers for the service of their employees in the National Guard and Reserve;

(5) recognizes the critical importance of the National Guard and Reserve to the security of the United States; and

(6) supports providing the necessary resources to ensure the continued readiness of the National Guard and Reserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 154.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), honoring the continuing commitment of Army National Guard combat units in support of U.S. operations in Bosnia.

Throughout our history, America's citizen soldiers have played a crucial role in making and keeping the peace. Nowhere has this been more evident than in recent deployments of the National Guard to support peacekeeping missions in Bosnia. Clearly, we are increasingly reliant on the men and women of the National Guard and Reserve to perform peacetime operational missions. For example, in 1996, the National Guard and Reserves provided less than 1 million duty days of direct support to active components. Today, they are providing in excess of 12 million duty days of support annually, the equivalent of nearly 34,000 active duty personnel.

In October 1999, the Army announced an important decision to employ National Guard combat units and National Guard division headquarters in support of the NATO peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. As a result, the 49th Armored Division headquarters for the Texas National Guard, and combat units from the 30th Enhanced Separate Brigade, North Carolina National Guard, and the 45th Enhanced Separate Brigade of the Oklahoma National Guard have completed deployments in Bosnia.

I am particularly proud of the 49th, because several of its members came from my district, soldiers like Bob Wenger of Amarillo, Texas. The 49th was the first Guard or Reserve unit to command active duty troops since World War II. They set the standard for others to follow. Today, more than 1,200 soldiers of the 48th Brigade, Georgia National Guard, have deployed in the largest such deployment of National Guard soldiers to Bosnia.

This resolution not only honors the commitment and dedication of the soldiers in these combat units who have left home and family to serve the Nation, but it also honors the sacrifices of their families and employers. It also serves as a reminder to us, and to the Nation, that the National Guard and Reserve are critically important to the security of the United States. Their readiness directly contributes to America's military readiness, and we must continue to provide the support necessary for both the active and reserve components to perform the missions assigned to them.

□ 1500

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 154, and I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Madam Speaker, H. Con. Resolution 154 commends the continued commitment of the Army National Guard combat units deployed in support of Army operation in Bosnia. It recognizes the important role of all National Guard and Reserve personnel, and it expresses appreciation to the employers of the Guard and the Reserves.

Since the first units of the National Guard were mobilized for deployment to Bosnia in December of 1995, our National Guardsmen and women and Reservists have played a vital and significant role in Bosnia. Their determined efforts have helped to stabilize the area and deter hostilities to facilitate long-term peace in that area.

Recognizing their valuable contributions, the Army began to mobilize and deploy the headquarters of the Army National Guard combat divisions and enhanced combat brigades in Bosnia. As increasing numbers of our National Guard and Reserves are being called to duty for peacekeeping operations, humanitarian missions, and combat, we also need to recognize the effect that this has on their families and to recognize the valiant effort by these families when personnel go abroad. Like those on active duty, Guard and Reserve personnel would not be able to focus on their mission without the support and the strength of their families. Madam Speaker, it really takes quite a lot out of families when someone gets uprooted and leaves their job for a while and goes across to work in Bosnia. So we really commend the families for their contributions and their sacrifices in this effort.

However, the Guard and the Reserve must also depend on the support of their employers. Can we imagine what it is like to have somebody who is very vital to one's business interests all of a sudden leave for 6 or 8 or 10 months? Without the support of employers across the country, Guard and Reservists would not be able to continue this important mission for the United States.

Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize and thank those employers for their essential support of the National Guard and our Reservists. It is the contributions of the service member, of the family, and the employers that play a role in our success in Bosnia and other regions. This successful combination allows us to have the best citizen soldiers in the world.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

In March, after completing preparations at Fort Polk, Louisiana and Fort Stewart, Georgia, some 1,200 soldiers of Georgia's 48th Infantry Brigade were deployed to Bosnia to participate in

the peacekeeping mission. They are following in the footsteps of other National Guard units that have been mentioned such as the Texas division, the 39th Enhanced Separate Brigade of North Carolina, and the 45th Enhanced Separate Brigade of Oklahoma. Our citizen soldiers are adding their strength to our efforts to bring peace to a bitter and divided land.

These men and women are part of more than 1.2 million soldiers who play a critical part in our national defense as members of our National Guard and Reserve components. They contribute significant time and effort to executing their roles, and we as a Nation are very grateful.

Our citizen soldiers have helped defend our freedom since the first minutemen took up their muskets to meet the British at Concord Bridge. From those grassy fields of New England to the burning sands of Kuwait, our guardsmen and reservists have fought with distinction.

As citizen soldiers, most guardsmen and reservists have two careers, civilian and military. After a hard week on the job, neighbors may be headed to the beach for the weekend, but many guardsmen are headed off to drill and to train. Neighbors may be watching emergencies on TV, but oftentimes guardsmen are already there helping victims of disorder and disaster.

As we see our guardsmen called up to serve in areas such as Bosnia over the long deployments, we should note the sacrifices as they leave home, family, and friends in the service of their country. This separation is hard on families and loved ones; but while we often note the burden on soldiers and their families, we often overlook someone who makes an equal sacrifice too, and those are the employers of those reservists and those guardsmen.

I want those employers to know that the Congress deeply appreciates the sacrifice that they knowingly make for our national security when they hire members of the National Guard and Reservists. As a small businessman, Madam Speaker, I know how business can be affected by the absence of a good worker for a period of as short as a day, much less for several weeks or months. It is tough on a business, no matter how large or small.

Our Nation is secure today because Americans stand ready to defend our freedom. The men and women of our National Guard and Reserve sacrifice their time and talent to serve in the military, even as they hold down those civilian jobs. The spirit of sacrifice is also exemplified by the families and the loved ones who support them whether they are off on a weekend drill or extended deployments overseas. For this we are grateful.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), our distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me

this time. I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 154. I urge that all of us in this body vote for it.

This resolution honors the Army National Guard combat units in Bosnia, recognizes the sacrifices of Guard and Reserve families, and expresses appreciation to employers of the Guard and Reserve members for their critical support. The Guard and Reserves have become increasingly critical to our national security through the years. Guard and Reserve personnel have been deployed around the world for numerous missions, including peacekeeping operations in Bosnia.

Madam Speaker, in recent weeks I have had the opportunity to visit with a good number of National Guard units in the Fourth Congressional District of Missouri, and soon I will have visited all of them. I must tell my colleagues that I am so proud of them. They are there because they want to be there. They take their training seriously; they take their mission seriously. When I asked them how many had been deployed in recent years, my colleagues should see the number of hands that are raised. I thank them for their sincerity and their dedication to the State and to our government here in the United States.

The October 1999 announcement by the Army to mobilize and deploy National Guard combat divisions to command active and Reserve forces in Bosnia was an historical landmark. Other various Guard combat support and combat service support units have been participating in Bosnia since December of 1995. For example, the 1137th Military Police Company from Kennett, Missouri was mobilized for Bosnia in December of 1995. Since then, the 70th Mobile Public Affairs Detachment and the 135th Military History Detachment from Jefferson City and the 40th Operational Support Airlift Command Detachment from Springfield have also seen service in Bosnia. These Missouri National Guardsmen and women have joined the thousands of guardsmen and reservists from across the Nation who have served the Nation so well.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

This is truly a unique time in the history of our Nation's military. The time of the National Guard being used solely for the purpose of missions within the U.S. borders is over. That is not to say the Guard does not play a vital role in our domestic situation, such as the flood recovery in my home area of Houston from the Storm Allison. In fact, and thank goodness, nearly 400 Guard members were called to active duty to assist the victims, my neighbors, in this devastation.

But that is not all they do. With the decreasing size of our active duty military, the role of the National Guard

has never been more important. All too often we forget about the important service our Guard units play in protecting our Nation's interests abroad.

Last year in February, National Guardsmen began pulling active duty overseas for the first time since the Korean War. And, for the first time since American soldiers went to Bosnia in late 1995, an Army National Guard unit performed the headquarters function and provided the true component for the peacekeeping mission there.

Madam Speaker, I am proud that the approximately 750 men and women who served in this precedent-setting mission were from the Texas 49th Armored Division, the Fighting 49th of the Texas National Guard, also known as the Lone Star Division. This unit returned home in October of last year following an 8-month peacekeeping duty in Bosnia. I had the pleasure of enjoying Easter Sunday services with our troops in Bosnia. I cannot tell my colleagues how impressed I was with the dedication and the professionalism and their dedication to the mission, our country, and their families.

This resolution today also hits home because one of my staff people, David Drake McGraw, will be commanding the Alpha Troop of the Maryland National Guard when it is deployed to Bosnia in a few months. My office is dealing with the same challenges as thousands of other employers across our country when employees, key employees are deployed as part of these units. Madam Speaker, I can tell my colleagues that it is not easy, but it is worthwhile. The sacrifice members of the National Guard make each year in order to serve their country through the military is in addition to working full-time jobs. It is great and must not be forgotten. I am proud of Drake, not only for his outstanding service to the residents of my district of Texas, but also for the sacrifice and service to our Nation.

Captain McGraw serves in the Maryland Army National Guard. His unit, the first of the 1/58 Cavalry, will be going to Bosnia on September 18 for about 7 months. He will be leaving behind his wife, Barbra and his young son, David. It is important to remember the sacrifice they are making while Drake is serving his country.

Madam Speaker, it is for these reasons that I proudly support this resolution.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, the National Guard personnel that are deployed in Bosnia are preventing widespread violence that could quickly reoccur if they were not there to serve their country in the cause of humanity. Every American owes them a deep debt of gratitude. They left their families, their homes, their careers behind to join our NATO

allies on a mission that is saving lives and making the world safe from a cruel conflict, one that could spread uncontrollably if not held in check.

This call-up is not fun. It is tough. It is grueling, and it is dangerous duty. But they willingly serve, and we are grateful.

In March, 1,200 citizen soldiers of the 48th Infantry Brigade began a 6-month tour of duty in Bosnia, the largest Georgia Guard mobilization since Operation Desert Storm. Other Guard personnel from my State and from other States have also served as peacekeepers there, and I urge the House to pass this resolution to honor the commitment and the sacrifice of every National Guard soldier who has faithfully served and who faithfully answers the call.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

□ 1515

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I especially appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for bringing this important resolution to honor the service of our National Guard heroes who have served our country so ably in Bosnia. I also thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for his efforts.

Madam Speaker, I have a particular interest in this resolution, and I am pleased to be a cosponsor because I am fortunate enough to represent Indiana's Atterbury National Guard base and Armed Forces Training Center at Atterbury. This facility has played an important role in preparing our reserve forces for deployment to the Bosnian theater. I am very proud of the work they do there.

In fact, Madam Speaker, the training facilities at Atterbury are the finest light fighting training site east of Mississippi, to hear them tell it. This distinction is deserved praise given the role they have played in getting our troops ready for service in Bosnia.

Since 1996, Hoosier National Guardsmen have had a continuous representation in Bosnia. Next spring, the 76th Separate Infantry Brigade will also be deployed in Bosnia. The newest mission amounts to nearly 300 infantry soldiers from all over the State of Indiana.

In addition to plain old home State pride for the work our National Guard personnel have done and are doing in Bosnia, it is with deep respect that I call attention to the preparation that is under way presently for the largest mobilization of Indiana's National Guard since World War II.

In the spring of 2004, the 38th Infantry Division Headquarters, based in east central Indiana, will deploy to Bosnia to run the Task Force Eagle Headquarters there and supervise all U.S. military operations. Hopefully, this 2004 mission will be the supervising of the final leg of our mission in that region.

For all the work that our men and women in the National Guard have done and will do in the future, Madam Speaker, I know I speak for all of my constituents in Indiana when I say, "Well done, good and faithful servants," and I thank them for all they have done to help secure relative peace and stability in the region.

House Concurrent Resolution 154 is a well-deserved tribute.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 154, a bill honoring the commitment of the Army National Guard combat units deployed in Bosnia and I urge my colleagues to give this measure their full support.

Our National Guard has played a vital role in our Nation's security, primarily by maintaining the concept of the "Citizen-Soldier." Our Nation's founders were distrustful of large standing armies. Consequently, the state militias, which later evolved into the National Guard, have always served as a working framework that stood by ready to supplement and augment the officer core of the regular military in times of war.

The most recent example of this has been the long-standing contribution the Army National Guard has made to the peacekeeping deployment in the Balkans. The Army National Guard units have performed an important supporting role backing up our active duty forces in those hazardous operations.

National Guard members face far more unpredictable military service than their active duty counterparts. The nature of their job requires them to be "on call" and ready to deploy overseas at a moments notice. As such, smooth deployments are dependent on the cooperation of both guard-member families and employers.

This resolution, in recognition of these factors, commends the sacrifices made by the families of guard-members and their civilian employers.

It also recognizes the increasingly vital role the Army National Guard plays in our Nation's national security.

Accordingly, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this measure honoring our Country's National Guard.

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 154 which honors our commitment to the Army National Guard combat units deployed in support of Army operations in Bosnia.

I have a special appreciation for this resolution today on two levels. As the Ranking Democrat on the House Military Readiness Subcommittee, issues of how to supplement the everyday personnel needs of our troops is a vital issue for us. Through the citizen soldiers of the National Guard, we are able to keep an all-volunteer force, which is as it should be in a free democratic Nation, and we have moved into the history-making realm by introducing National Guard troops into active component combat forces, as well as multinational forces.

On another level, for Texas, the knowledge that the 49th "Lone Star" Texas National Guard Armored Division in Bosnia was ushering in a new era of the composition of active-duty military personnel has made patriots in the state extremely proud. However inevitable it was, with over half of the Army's strength in the Guard and reserves, the decision nevertheless opened a new era for the population of our armed forces.

When the decision was announced, the 49th "Lone Star" National Guard Armored Division received an amazing number of calls from the active components offering help in training. The easy relationship between these comrades in arms is the foundation for the success of the mission and for future successes in deployments. It also debunks the theory that there is a rivalry between the active components and the Guard or reserves.

South Texas has a proud tradition of military and military support. This mission of the 49th "Lone Star" Division was no different. All elements of the 49th "Lone Star" Division were deployed through the Port of Corpus Christi, which was designated as a strategic seafort seaport in 1998. South Texas watched this history happening from the front row. We supported the 49th at the outset of their mission, we applauded them at its conclusion, and we recognized the historic nature of the deployments of the Guard and reserves to front lines of our country's military deployments overseas.

South Texas support the National Guard and the reserves, we understand their commitment to our national security, and we thank them for their service to our nation. We honor their sacrifice, realize their critical importance to the country and we support providing the necessary resources to ensure their continued readiness condition.

I thank my colleagues for their work on this resolution.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam Speaker, I support this resolution to honor our National Guard troops in Bosnia. Especially the men and women of Georgia's 48th Brigade now serving in Bosnia. Georgia's National Guard has a long and cherished military history dating back as far as the 1730's. From helping to secure American independence, to the Spanish American War to World War I and II, to Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf, Georgia's National Guard has played an important role in protecting the defending American interests around the world.

From the headquarters and part of the 148th Forward Support Battalion in Macon to the 2nd Battalion of Company A of the 121st Infantry based in Moultrie and Valdosta, the 48th Infantry Brigade (Mechanized) continues to honor its past by proudly serving in Bosnia. The men and women of the 48th have spent months undergoing extensive training and preparation for this deployment. They have put their jobs and family lives on hold and all told will have been away from their homes and families for almost a year.

Today, we say thank you to the families and employers for their sacrifices in supporting our National Guard. And we say thank you and God bless you to the citizen soldiers who are doing such an outstanding job to support U.S. peacekeeping efforts in the Balkans.

Mr. FALOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 154, a resolution honoring the continued commitment of the Army National Guard combat units deployed in Bosnia and recognizing the sacrifices made by these units.

Madam Speaker, as our country moved away from the cold war, we made a conscious decision to lower the size of our active duty forces. At the same time, as a matter of policy, we maintained our goal of fighting two simultaneous wars. The only way we could

achieve both goals was to increase our reliance on our national guard and military reserve units.

For years, national guard and reserve units were thought of safe as ways to fulfill military service obligations or collect a little extra money every month. For decades that was true. Each drilling reservist or national guardsman reported for duty one weekend a month and two weeks per year, and that was all we asked of them. That whole concept of being a reservist changed during the 1990s, a decade in which our reserve and guard units were called to active duty time and time again including places such as the Middle East, Africa, and of course Bosnia.

Every time we as a nation call up a reserve unit, the vast majority of the members of that unit are pulled away from their families and jobs here in the United States. In addition to the personal sacrifices these individuals make, often times there is a monetary sacrifice as well. With everything we ask of our reserve and national guard personnel, they truly do deserve special recognition, and I am pleased to stand before our nation today and say thank you.

To every member of a national guard unit, to every reservist, to their families, and to every employer who hires or employs a member of a guard or reserve unit, I say thank you for your support of our nation. As the only super-power, the United States is expected to provide leadership in distant locations throughout the world. We have done this unilaterally, and as members of multi-national forces. When the nation has called, our citizen-soldiers have responded and continue to respond. We all owe them a debt of gratitude, and again I say thank you.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res 154, honoring National Guard Combat units deployed in support of operations in Bosnia.

I know the commitments and sacrifice that the citizen soldiers and their families must make in supporting the defense of this great nation.

I have done my share of traveling and I have visited with my fellow soldiers in the National Guard, both in my congressional capacity and in my Reserve capacity.

As such, I am well aware how the National Guard contributes to national security.

Believe me, it is a story that needs to be shared with hometown USA, and more importantly, with Members of Congress.

Today's National Guard is an essential component of the Total Force.

No longer a force in reserve; the National Guard is integral to all operations today.

In fact, it is a force in readiness.

Because the military today cannot perform its missions without the support and augmentation of the National Guard, it is being used more frequently, and to a greater extent than ever before.

Since we started sending soldiers to Bosnia in 1995, the National Guard has assumed an every increasing role in that deployment.

In fact, the Bosnia operation marks a pivotal point in this nation's military history.

It marks the first time that a National Guard division headquarters served as the command and control element of Active Army component and multi-national forces in the Post Cold War.

This is truly remarkable!

According to the Department of Defense, our NATO partners, and the population in Bosnia, one cannot tell the difference between the National Guardsmen, and the soldiers of the active component.

By any measure, our National Guard personnel have performed extremely well, completing vital missions and bringing critical, and in some cases unique, skills to this operation.

Operations in the Balkans are proof that our reserve forces cannot be viewed as low priority units for manpower, equipment, and funding.

That is a luxury we cannot afford.

H. Con. Res. 154 is a reminder to all of us in this body, to all the leaders in the Pentagon, and to all Americans that the National Guard is critical to the defense of this nation, and we must support our reserve component forces if we hope to be victorious in the future.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia who introduced this legislation for this opportunity to honor the commitment and courage of the Army National Guard units that continue to serve as part of the NATO peacekeeping forces in Bosnia.

In April of 2000, during our Easter recess, I had the opportunity to visit the soldiers of the 49th "Lone Star" Armored Division of the Texas National Guard, during their tour of duty in Bosnia.

This unit recorded a first in Army history, as it was the first time that a National Guard division headquarters was the command and control element of active duty component forces as well as multinational forces. These Texas citizen-soldiers acquitted themselves with honor and proved that the Guard is a reliable part of our armed forces.

The soldiers in these units aren't the only ones who deserve recognition. These men and women would not be able to serve without the sacrifices made by their families, who do without a spouse or parent, or their employers, who lose the service of a valued employee, for the length of their tour.

This mission underscores the value of the National Guard and Reserve to the security of the United States. As members of Congress, we recognize the benefit of the National Guard and Reserve and I hope that we will recognize the needs of these units so that they can continue to be an effective component of our armed services.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this Member rises to express support for H. Con. Res. 154, recognizing the role of Army National Guard combat units operating in Bosnia. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is to be commended for introducing this legislation which also recognizes the sacrifices of reservists' families during arduous deployments.

Additionally, this Member wishes to use this occasion to recognize the crucial role Army National Guard support units play in NATO peacekeeping missions. Simply, the Army National Guard combat units cannot perform their overseas duties without the assistance of support units. For example, the 24th Medical Company, which is based in this Member's district and is comprised of reservists from Nebraska and Kansas, deployed to Bosnia in 1999. During its deployment, the company

provided key medical assistance for NATO forces. In one instance, the company even found itself rescuing a combat unit which found itself trapped in a minefield. To avoid detonation of the mines, the combat unit stood on the hood of its vehicle as the 24th Medical Company lowered its helicopter and whisked the other unit to safety. Support units often are placed into precarious situations and are deserving of recognition for their efforts beyond their routine duties.

Madam Speaker, legislation such as H. Con. Res. 154 offers Congress an opportunity to reaffirm the important role of all National Guard combat and support such units in each of the armed services.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 154.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 163) recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day and expressing the sense of Congress that history be regarded as a means of understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 163

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the country until long after the conclusion of the Civil War, especially in the Southwestern United States;

Whereas the African Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest thereafter celebrated June 19, known as Juneteenth Independence Day, as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas these African Americans handed down that tradition from generation to generation as an inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have thus been held for 136 years to honor the memory of all those who endured slavery and especially those who moved from slavery to freedom; and

Whereas the faith and strength of character shown by these former slaves remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, region, or race: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) Congress recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, an important date in the Nation's history, and encourages the continued celebration of this day to provide an opportunity for all people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the Nation; and

(2) it is the sense of Congress that—

(A) history be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future; and

(B) the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 163.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 163, and commend the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for sponsoring this important resolution. The resolution recognizes the historic significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and encourages its continued celebration so all Americans can learn more about our past.

The resolution also expresses the sense of Congress that knowing our history helps us understand our past and solve challenges we face in the future, and it expresses the sense of Congress that the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States.

Madam Speaker, Juneteenth has long been recognized as the day to celebrate the end of slavery in the United States. Juneteenth is the traditional celebration of the day on which the last slaves in America were freed.

Although slavery was abolished officially in 1863, it took over 2 years for news of freedom to spread to all slaves. On June 19th, 1865, U.S. General Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, Texas and announced that the State's 200,000 slaves were free. Vowing never to forget the date, the former slaves coined the nickname Juneteenth, a blend of the words June and 19th, actually today. This holiday originated in the Southwest, but today it is celebrated throughout the Nation.

This resolution underscores that the observance of Juneteenth Independence Day is an important and enriching part of our country's history and heritage. The celebration of Juneteenth provides

an opportunity for all Americans to learn more about our common past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped our great Nation.

I urge all Members to approve the resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I first of all want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), and I am pleased to join with him in introducing this resolution and bringing it to the floor for quick action.

I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 163, particularly today, Juneteenth Independence Day. On January 1, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves of the southern States that had seceded from the Union.

However, it was not until June 19, 1865, that the Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, landed at Galveston, Texas, with the news that the war had ended and that all slaves were now free.

The reaction to the news ranged from shock to immediate jubilation. June 19th, coined Juneteenth, became a time for former slaves to pray and to gather together with remaining family members. Education, self-improvement, and prayer services were and still are a major part of Juneteenth celebrations.

Though Texas is the only State to declare June 19 a legal holiday, it is celebrated in communities throughout the country. Juneteenth celebrations are a tribute to all Americans who fought to end slavery and who work hard for social and racial equality. It is an appropriate holiday to precede Independence Day on July 4. The promise of justice and equality contained within the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution were realized on this day for many people in 1865.

Today marks the 136th celebration of Juneteenth, which was originally handed down through the old tradition, from generation to generation, and finally formally honored for the first time in Texas in 1972.

Juneteenth is indeed a time to reflect on and honor those who suffered the tragedy of slavery in America. It is also a time to appreciate the social, political, educational, and economic possibilities afforded by social and racial equality. In short, Juneteenth for many African Americans represents what the Fourth of July means for mainstream America: a celebration of the promise of freedom.

As I listened this morning to my favorite radio station, WVON, to talk show host Cliff Kelly, my former colleague from the Chicago City Council, as Cliff was engaging callers in Juneteenth and the meaning of it, all of the calls were indeed positive and represented the idea that celebration was appropriate for this day.

So I want to commend radio station WVON for its efforts. I also want to congratulate and commend State Representative Monique Davis, who has introduced legislation in the Illinois General Assembly. This resolution recognizes Juneteenth Day as a day that all of America can celebrate freedom, and recognize that being free, spiritually, physically, socially, financially, educationally, and professionally is meaningful.

So for this reason, I urge all of my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 163.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS).

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, when General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, on this day 136 years ago, slaves were given notice that they were free. Even though President Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation had the effect of law on the first day of 1863, his executive order was not in force to even communicate it in some parts of our Nation.

The celebrations on the evening of June 19, 1865, were filled with singing and feasting. After so much injustice, the last vestige of slavery had been eradicated and the United States was truly a land where, as our Declaration of Independence declared, all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Juneteenth is a day of celebration and of learning. We should rejoice in the great land that we all call America and give thanks for our freedom, and know that there were days when that freedom was not enjoyed by all of her citizens.

The resolution we are considering today recognizes Juneteenth and encourages Americans to learn from our past so we may better prepare for our future. It celebrates the achievements of all Americans, no matter if they are red, yellow, brown, black, or white, and offers us an opportunity to reflect on how one country saw slavery and freedom within the course of our relatively short existence as a nation in this world.

I thank my colleagues for their support on this Juneteenth resolution, and I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate that the gentleman from Illinois has yielded me this time, and I appreciate his work on this and so many bills of importance to the African American community and to our country.

I appreciate the work of my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), who is managing the bill, who has always stood for principles of equal opportunity, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) for his leadership in bringing forward this bill, as well.

Madam Speaker, I am not sure how to approach Juneteenth. It is a date fraught with poignancy and symbolism, poignancy because it is not the date on which the slaves were emancipated. That was January 1, 1863. It was simply the date that the good news finally made its way into Texas; some say by conspiracy, some say just because they did not get there and somebody was waylaid.

In any case, it was a cause for great celebration. If one learned 2½ years late that slaves had been emancipated by the Emancipation Proclamation, that is to say, by executive order, one had every reason to celebrate.

We are not here this afternoon to celebrate. This date is fraught with symbolism as well because the news of the civil rights laws has not reached all who need to hear it in America. I speak as a former chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, where I had hands-on experience, up close, to see what enforcement takes, and as a Member of Congress to see what we still have to do now.

□ 1530

Nobody who celebrated her emancipation on June 19, 1865, would want us to do anything but make this not a cause of celebration, not even a cause for commemoration, but a cause for combustion, to get the news out to those in the administration, to employers and to Americans throughout our country, that the civil rights laws are not only in the books but they need strong enforcement.

Indeed, Madam Speaker, we need new laws as well. I have introduced a racial profiling bill that I hope will be part of the transportation bill coming forward next year. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is also preparing a racial profiling bill.

These bills indicate that there is real unfinished work even on putting laws on the books. It takes us back to the 1960s. We thought we had at least put the laws on the books then. Racial profiling is overt, deliberate, looking in your face, you are black, you are Hispanic, you do not look like me, you are under arrest or at least I-am-stopping-you discrimination. That is the kind of discrimination this is.

We cannot let \$250 billion go out of this House next year, unless there is a provision that says you cannot get this money unless you have laws barring racial profiling, unless you enforce them and unless you keep racial statistics.

Look, if we reduce Juneteenth to a moment of nostalgia, we trivialize its importance. Our country was 2½ weeks late getting to the slaves in Texas. We are 2½ centuries late taking care of this business called discrimination.

Let Resolution 163 be the beginning of the end of the last great form of overt and deliberate discrimination in our country, the discrimination that stops a man or stops a woman on the street only because that person is black. If my colleagues are willing to vote for this resolution, I hope my colleagues will vote to give it meaning when the racial profiling provisions come to the floor.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, let me begin by offering my congratulations and commendations to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), as well as to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), my Republican colleague, for their leadership in bringing this matter to our attention; but for their efforts, Juneteenth might be a little-noticed footnote in American history.

That certainly should not be the case, because, while it is not recognized on a par with the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation is like the Declaration of Independence, part of our tradition and passion for freedom in the United States.

It is a very interesting episode in our history, and I find myself fascinated by it, that Abraham Lincoln, through executive order, declared the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863; but somehow the word did not get to slaves in Texas until 2½ years later, on June 19, 1865.

There are lots of stories as to what happened. There is some that say that the original messenger was murdered. There are others who say the Union soldiers who had the message thought that they would hold off so the slave owners could get in another season's worth of planting and reaping before the word went out that slavery was to be no more.

Whatever the case was, on June 19, 1865, Major General Jordan Granger led Union troops into Galveston, Texas, and announced that, in fact, slavery had come to an end; and now the relationship between the former slaves and the former masters was going to be that of employer and free laborer.

As you might imagine, some of the newly freed slaves did not wait around to negotiate a labor agreement on this subject. They immediately left their plantations, their former owners and headed north, as well as to other parts of the country where they had family, to begin their new lives.

There were many who did stay around to talk about it, and out of that experience evolved what we have come to call Juneteenth, the celebration of the Emancipation Proclamation. It arrived out of a rural tradition of a family gathering, of picnics and barbecues and, generally, a notion that this is a great thing, this freedom, that we are very pleased to be a part of it and let us take advantage of it.

It also evolved into an opportunity to focus on questions of education and self-improvement which was really what freedom from slavery was all about, an opportunity to get education and, most importantly, an opportunity to express that freedom through self-improvement.

Today we do have a celebration called Juneteenth to mark that historic occasion. This occasion, however, does reflect forward to events that happen today in America. You can say in the case of Juneteenth, things do not always work the way they were intended, a message arrived 2½ years late.

Recently in Florida, things did not work the way they were intended, and you have to excuse the African American community if we are a little bit skeptical. We consider there to have been great disenfranchisement, and things did not work the way they should have. People who were eligible to vote were denied an opportunity to vote to a significant degree.

Madam Speaker, out of Juneteenth comes not just skepticism, it comes hope, because the newly freed slaves had hoped that they would be full participants in America. And despite the difficulties that we have seen in the Florida in the past election, we are moving forward with hope that an electoral reform bill will come out of this Congress, which will make sure that things that did not go the way they should have will go the right way in the future.

Juneteenth is not just a celebration of what happened. It is also an important milestone in our American history and a marker for our future conduct. It joins many other cultural celebrations, Cinco de Mayo, St. Patrick's Day, the Chinese New Year, as a part of our diverse American quilt.

It is an important occasion, an occasion for great celebration, the emancipation of the slaves in America. I am delighted to be a part of this celebration; and again, I thank the sponsors.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the very capable gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the very distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding me such time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 163, which celebrates Juneteenth, the oldest known celebration of the end of slavery. I want to commend the two authors of this resolution, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), for introducing this resolution.

Though the abolishment of slavery and Confederate States had become official more than 2 years earlier in 1863, it had little impact on Texans, because there were no Union troops to enforce the new edict.

It was not until June 19, 1865, that the final group of slaves were freed by

Union troops who brought news of the Emancipation Proclamation to Galveston, Texas.

I find it to be a testament of the strength and growth of our great Nation that on January 1, 1980, in the same State that the last slaves were freed, Juneteenth became an official State holiday through the efforts of Al Edwards, an African American Texas State legislator.

The successful passage of this bill marked Juneteenth as the first emancipation celebration to be granted official State recognition.

Today's resolution clearly states that history should be regarded as a means of understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future. Juneteenth reminds us that we must continue to challenge the American conscience and strive to create civil equality for all of our brothers and sisters. Racism and inequality, distrust and misunderstanding often continue to divide us as a Nation.

Our efforts will not be finished until social justice prevails and all of our children can contemplate "a Nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character."

Today, it is important that we also promote the celebration of Juneteenth in our communities. Last night in my district, Montgomery County, Maryland, Juneteenth committee members Laura Anderson Wright, Russ Campbell, Tina Clark, Wilbert Givens, Dory Hackey, Richard Myles, Shirley Small Rogeau, and Gail Street held a celebration, which they had organized, that began with a tour at the Sandy Spring Maryland Slave Museum and African Art Gallery, whose president and founder was there, Dr. Winston Anderson. The ceremony concluded at the Ross Body Community Center in the historic town of Sandy Spring, Maryland.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend these committee members for their dedication and hard work for such a noble cause.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to ensure that Juneteenth is celebrated in their home districts and to support this resolution on the 136th anniversary of the emancipation.

I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for his generosity in yielding me such time as I have consumed.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the very passionate gentleman from New Jersey, (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, two great Americans sponsored this resolution, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS). I am proud to be associated with both of them.

Juneteenth, but also the name of a great book written by what I consider one of the great authors of the 20th century, Ralph Ellison, who wrote the "Invisible Man," often misunderstood, often derided.

Madam Speaker, yes, the Supreme Court made a decision and Dred Scott, in that decision, was overturned in 1862, actually, 3 years before exactly to the day of Juneteenth; sometimes the Supreme Court needs to be corrected by the Congress of the United States.

The Emancipation Proclamation receives its national appreciation, its rightful appreciation as the gateway to freedom for African Americans; but it took a Civil War and the 13th amendment to the United States to formally outlaw slavery.

That Emancipation Proclamation resulted in millions of slaves throughout the country who were unaffected by the provisions of the proclamation; and as my colleagues have already heard, word traveled very slowly.

Madam Speaker, this is indeed a celebration, but time for us to reflect on what this meant. Juneteenth serves as a historical milestone reminding all people of the triumph of the human spirit over the cruelty of slavery.

I think we should all take a moment not only to recognize the moral bankruptcy of slavery, but also to celebrate the achievements of those living in such inhumane conditions; and despite the rigors of slavery, African Americans contributed everything from agricultural inventions and medical breakthroughs to music. They have contributed a legacy of culture, of language, religion, a lesson of survival.

Ralph Ellison, who I believe is one of the great writers of the 20th century, he was an African American and frequently misunderstood. The genius of blacks, of black culture, was not in race, he wrote, but in human beings who bore the race. Blood and skin do not think.

There were demonic conscious and unconscious dehumanizing acts against blacks, no question about it; but the progress and opportunity for blacks in America could not depend on white oppressors changing their behavior and changing their mind as much as it would depend on individuals understanding and believing in their own God-given resources.

□ 1545

Ellison believed that to believe solely in the idea that white oppression determined the freedom of blacks was to minimize the power of each black person and it would make redemption depend upon how it was treated. We do not accept that any longer. This was a perspective. The outskirts of society allowed him to run point on its greatest ideals while grieving over its greatest failures.

He argued against the idea that there existed a required mode of racial anger. There were, he contended, many possible responses to injustice. He wrote there was even an American Negro tradition which abhors as obscene any trading on one's own anguish for gain or sympathy. Powerful words. Powerful words in our own society now.

We have decided for the most part that each black person in our society is

an incarnation, someone wrote that, of his race, and as Edward Rothstein wrote, being battered about by both blacks and whites who impose their visions of racial identity. Lincoln freed the slaves. Ellison would say only that slaves could free slaves, so that their fate and the fate of every black American cannot depend on anyone else. Individuality is a creative force within each person. Part of our birth, part of our heritage, and at best the body politic can protect but never create. No civil rights law, no Supreme Court decision, and no presidential order can undo what is in me.

I thank Ralph Ellison for giving us our great history and understanding, and on this great day of Juneteenth we celebrate the freedom of all of us. God bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 12½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I know we have the right to close, but I would be happy to use my time and then yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) if he would like to close this debate.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time and commend the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for introducing this resolution. I also thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization, as well as the ranking members of the full committee and subcommittees, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), for expediting consideration of the resolution.

Obviously, I urge all Members to support this resolution. I was reading the Emancipation Proclamation during part of this debate, and while I will not read it at this time, let me just say that it is a powerful piece. And when read in conjunction with General Granger's General Order Number 3, this paragraph, I can imagine what the impact must have been. General Granger comes into Galveston and he reads the following: "The people of Texas are informed that, in accordance with the Proclamation of the Executive of the United States, all slaves are freed. This involves an absolute equality of rights," he continued, "and rights of property between former masters and slaves, and the connection heretofore existing between them becomes that between employer and free laborer."

It is a powerful piece and, obviously, Americans have much to be grateful for. We can be very proud of our country that, in spite of all the terrible things that may have occurred during parts of our history, we are a Nation that moves forward, not backwards. I

think all of us are so proud to be Americans, but it is a work in process. The freedoms that were guaranteed under the Emancipation Proclamation and under the General Order Number 3 are still unfolding.

It is an exciting time to be an American, and I just am grateful to have the opportunity to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to serve our country and to serve our great people of all races.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and first let me thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for his graciousness and for his support of this resolution. There is not a more esteemed Member of this body with more graciousness than the gentleman from Connecticut, and I want him to know that we appreciate him.

I also, Madam Speaker, want to again congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) for the role that he has played in not only introducing but moving this resolution to the floor. I also want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), for making sure that there was an opportunity to discuss this resolution on the floor of the House on this day, June 19th, Juneteenth Day.

Madam Speaker, I know the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) had planned to be here and to speak on the resolution. Unfortunately, she was unable to do so.

I think this resolution speaks to America, some of its paradoxes, some of its problems; the recognition that even as slaves were freed, there were over 800,000 who did not know it, and there are people who would say that there are many people in our country today who do not know some of the freedoms that exist. There are many people in our country who do not know that they have an opportunity to seriously impact upon all of the public policy decisions that are made in our great Nation.

As we look at the tremendous documents that we have seen evolved, and as we recognize what they really meant, they really meant that there is the opportunity to always be in pursuit of freedom of equality, of justice, of equal opportunity. It also means that we are not there yet. But as long as there is movement towards the goal, then there is hope and possibility for America. There is the hope that America can become the America that it has not been but the America that we all know that it can be.

I also want to point out that this resolution provides an opportunity for us to take a look at a part of our history,

the period of reconstruction. And I want to commend Lerone Bennett, Senior Editor of Ebony Magazine, for the research and writings and work that he has done.

Finally, it was never brought to my attention more than last weekend, while driving to St. Louis to participate in a function with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), when my father and I, who is 89 years old, after the activity was able to interact with my uncle, who is 96 years old. Fortunately for both of them, they still have their wits and they still can recall things and they are both functional. They were discussing the period of their boyhoods and the fact that their grandparents were slaves; that my father's mother's parents were slaves; that my mother's mother's parents were slaves.

I am amazed at how much progress they made during the period of reconstruction without formal education, without a great deal of learning but using the experiences of their previous conditions to help build a new America. So Juneteenth recommends and recognizes not only the past but the presence and speaks to the future. So I would urge all of my colleagues to support it and would once again thank all of those who have helped to bring it to the floor on this day.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of June 19, 2001, as Juneteenth Independence Day. I am pleased that House Concurrent Resolution 163 passed earlier today, recognizes the significance Juneteenth Independence Day and the importance of understanding our history and applying those lessons to our futures.

On January 1, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln delivered the Emancipation Proclamation freeing slaves across this country. Unfortunately, the Emancipation Proclamation had very little impact on Texas slaves where the news of the new freedom was deliberately withheld by the enslavers to maintain the labor forces on their plantations.

On June 19, 1865, more than two years after the Emancipation Proclamation was delivered, General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas informing those still enslaved that they were now free. General Granger's first order of business was to read to the people General Order Number 3, which states, "The people of Texas are informed that in accordance with a Proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free. This involves an absolute equality of rights and rights of property between former masters and slaves, and connection heretofore existing between them becomes that between employer and free laborer."

Today, we recognize the 136th anniversary of Juneteenth. Across America hundreds of celebrations are held to commemorate this important occasion. In my district, the Rock House Church International held a Juneteenth Jubilee at Recreation Park in Long Beach, California this past Saturday. This celebration served as a time for the community to gather and celebrate the freedoms all enjoy today. This event concluded with Leon Patillo signing the national anthem at the Long Beach Breakers baseball game. A fitting conclusion to the Juneteenth Jubilee.

Juneteenth was given official holiday status in Texas in 1980. Juneteenth has traditionally been celebrated in Texas and other bordering states, such as Louisiana and Arkansas. I thank Congressman Watts of Oklahoma for introducing House Concurrent Resolution 163 and expanding recognition of this event to a national celebration. Bringing this legislation to the floor today helps to bring awareness of Juneteenth to all corners of this country. Americans should use this historical milestone to remind us of the triumph of freedom over the cruelty of slavery.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today to show my strong support for the recognition of the day that slavery in the United States came to an end. June 19, 1865 was coined as "Juneteenth Independence Day," for the newly freed slaves of the Southwest when they finally learned of the Thirteenth Amendment that legally abolished slavery, which was passed in January of 1863. This delay of vital news as delayed by the dawdling relay of information across the country in that day.

Since that day of emancipation, the descendants of slaves in the Southwest view this day as the anniversary of the end of a tragic period in our nation's history. It is known that the dishonor, suffering and brutality of slavery cannot be erased, but the memory and feeling can provide reassurance that such inhumanity should never again take part in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, Juneteenth Independence Day is historically significant for not only those races subject to discrimination, but also for every freedom-loving American. It is a date that marked the development of equality, equal opportunity, and unity in the United States. I urge all of my fellow Members to vote with me in support of this bill that provides a means for both understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge the Congress to recognize the historic significance of Juneteenth Independence Day. On July 4, 1776, many Americans celebrated their first independence day. However, we must not forget that on this day, the ancestors of African Americans were not included in this celebration. They were slaves. In 1841, Frederick Douglass said that from an American slave's perspective, July 4th "reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim." It would be almost ninety years before all Americans would finally celebrate their freedom.

On June 19, 1865, two and a half years after President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation and two months after the conclusion of the Civil War, Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas to announce that all slaves in the United States were free. This day, known as Juneteenth, signified the end of slavery across America and marked the independence of African Americans.

What began as a celebration in Texas has grown into a nationwide remembrance of one of the most significant events in our country's history. Today, Juneteenth festivities bring African American communities across the country together to honor and remember the struggle of our ancestors and rejoice in our freedom.

This historic day also recognizes the importance of furthering the knowledge of our great

Nation's history. Festivities remembering Juneteenth provide the opportunity for all Americans to gain a deeper understanding of those events that have shaped our nation's identity and the issues that continue to touch so many of our lives. Texas may have been late in receiving the news, but they were the first to acknowledge the importance of this day, making it a state holiday over twenty years ago. We, as a nation, should follow suit and pay tribute to this important day in American history.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Juneteenth. Juneteenth is a commemoration of the acknowledgment by African slaves in Galveston, Texas, on June 19, 1865, of their newfound freedom. It is also a celebration of the opportunity for African Americans to be free to express self-improvement and to gain more knowledge. This freedom was granted to all those in the United States of African descent by the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863. Unfortunately, in some parts of the country, news of the Proclamation did not reach people in a timely manner. In fact, it took two years to get word out to African slaves in Texas that their freedom had been granted. Although word was given to the slaves late, we must remember that it is never too late to join the effort to fight against racism around the world.

Some in this nation may not want to recall the atrocities of our past, however, we must not forget our history. While this nation has a great legacy to be proud of, we must also remember the mistakes of our past and learn from them. Today, we cannot act as if nothing is wrong when negative assumptions are made about an individual because of the color of his or her skin.

The question that still remains is how do we move forward. A few months from now, South Africa will play host to what will be the third World Conference Against Racism. This event is scheduled to take place in Durban, South Africa August 31st to September 7th 2001. As a nation, our participation in this conference is vital. As citizens of the United States of America, we all want to see our country moving forward stronger than ever. By supporting this conference, we can make an effort to moving this country, as well as the world in the right direction.

I believe strongly that this day, June 19th is not only a celebration for African Americans, but also a celebration for our country as a whole. It represents all of the hardships that African Americans had to go through in helping construct this country and finally getting freedom and respect for the hardships they endured. As a citizen of this great country, I feel that it is America's duty to come together in showing respect to our fellow Americans on this day.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of Juneteenth Independence Day that represents the end of slavery in the South. On January 1, 1863, Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation freed all slaves. However, it was not until two and a half years later that all states were freed from bondage. Since that day on June 19, 1865, descendants of slaves have celebrated Juneteenth day. This celebration commemorates the struggles, dignity, and vision of a people who have rendered their lives for this great nation.

Although, Juneteenth Independence Day originated in Galveston, Texas, this day of

celebration delineates the importance of African American history all over the United States. In my district, a small town called Princeville reaps the benefit of Juneteenth Day. Princeville, the nation's oldest black chartered town was incorporated in February 1885 by the North Carolina General Assembly. The town of Princeville began as a small village of newly freed slaves who were trying to obtain their "day of jubilee." These slaves fought with grace to have something that they could call their own.

Juneteenth Independence Day completes the cycle of what we recognize as true democracy. The memories and history of that glorious day in June of 1865, has motivated African Americans as a people to continue to fight for equality for all. At this very moment, black voters in the state of Virginia have been moved by this day to get out and vote.

June 19th represents TRUE JUSTICE and TRUE FREEDOM. Let us not forget the importance that this day has impressed upon our history both past and present.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a celebration of freedom known as Juneteenth. In cities across the country, thousands of Americans—people of all nationalities, races and religions—are assembling to rejoice and reflect upon a milestone in American history—the official end of slavery.

Celebration of Juneteenth, June 19, as Emancipation Day began in 1865 when Texan slaves were finally notified of their freedom from the shackles of slavery. Prior to June 19, 1985, rumors of slavery were widespread; however, emancipation was not granted to Texan slaves until General Gordon Granger issued an order in Galveston, Texas declaring freedom for all slaves—some two years after President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation. When Texan slaves were finally given the news, a spirit of jubilee spread throughout the community as they prayed, sang and danced in celebration of their freedom. Newly freed slaves left the homes of slave-owners and immediately searched for family members and economic opportunities. Some simply chose to relish in their freedom. As a native Texan myself, I feel so strongly about the importance of Juneteenth and its legacy today.

Although many place significance on the untimely manner in which the news was delivered, reflecting upon the triumph and perseverance of the human spirit captures the true essence of the Juneteenth celebration. Juneteenth honors those African-Americans who travelled and survived the institution of slavery, thus encouraging free generations of African-Americans to take pride in the legacy of perseverance and strength they left behind.

As the popularity of Juneteenth grows both nationally and globally, people from all races, nationalities and creeds and realizing that Juneteenth is not only synonymous with slavery. Juneteenth represents an acknowledgment of a period in our history that shaped and continues to influence our society today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 163, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1807

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON H.R. 2216, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-102) on the bill (H.R. 2216) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REPORT ON H.R. 2217, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. SKEEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-103) on the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002 and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democrat Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 169) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 169

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Rules: Mr. McGovern of Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Rules:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2001.

HON. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC
DEAR MR. SPEAKER, I hereby resign from the House Committee on Rules.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on International Relations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2001.

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As I have been appointed to the House Rules Committee effective today, I hereby resign my seat as a Member of the House International Relations Committee.

As always, I appreciate your support and friendship.

Warmly,

ALCEE L. HASTINGS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 170) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 170

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Rules: Mr. Hastings of Florida;

Committee on International Relations: Mrs. Watson of California.

Committee on Government Reform: Mrs. Watson of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1291, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 154, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Con. Res. 163, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

21ST CENTURY MONTGOMERY GI BILL ENHANCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1291.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1291, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)
Ackerman	Brady (TX)	Davis (FL)
Aderholt	Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)
Akin	Brown (OH)	Davis, Jo Ann
Allen	Brown (SC)	Deal
Andrews	Bryant	DeFazio
Armey	Burr	DeGette
Baca	Burton	DeLauro
Bachus	Buyer	DeLay
Baird	Callahan	DeMint
Baker	Calvert	Deutsch
Baldacci	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Baldwin	Cantor	Dicks
Ballenger	Capito	Dingell
Barcia	Capps	Doggett
Barr	Capuano	Dooley
Barrett	Cardin	Doolittle
Bartlett	Carson (IN)	Doyle
Barton	Carson (OK)	Dreier
Bass	Castle	Duncan
Becerra	Chabot	Dunn
Bentsen	Chambliss	Edwards
Bereuter	Clay	Ehlers
Berkley	Clayton	Ehrlich
Berman	Clement	Emerson
Berry	Clyburn	Engel
Biggert	Coble	Eshoo
Bilirakis	Collins	Etheridge
Bishop	Combest	Evans
Blagojevich	Condit	Everett
Blumenauer	Conyers	Farr
Blunt	Cooksey	Fattah
Boehrlert	Costello	Ferguson
Boehner	Coyne	Flake
Bonilla	Cramer	Fletcher
Bonior	Crane	Foley
Bono	Crenshaw	Ford
Borski	Crowley	Fossella
Boswell	Culberson	Frank
Boucher	Cummings	Frelinghuysen
Boyd	Cunningham	

Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)

Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman

Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberti
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Filner

NOT VOTING—15

Cannon
Cox
Cubin
Davis, Tom
English

Gephardt
Gibbons
Hinchey
Jones (OH)
McCarthy (MO)

Obey
Peterson (PA)
Sanders
Scott
Sweeney

□ 1834

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 166 passage of H.R. 1291, I was detained in my district attending the funeral service of a distinguished civic leader, Kenneth Krakauer. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been advised by the Clerk that a small number of the electronic voting stations are not operative. Those stations are marked, but Members nevertheless should take care to confirm their votes.

HONORING ARMY NATIONAL
GUARD COMBAT UNITS DE-
PLOYED IN SUPPORT OF ARMY
OPERATIONS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 154.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 154, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey

Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger

Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra

Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher

Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)

Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher	Skeen	Toomey	Barr	Farr	Largent	Roemer	Simmons	Tiberi
Ros-Lehtinen	Skelton	Towns	Barrett	Fattah	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Tierney
Ross	Slaughter	Traffant	Barlett	Ferguson	Larson (CT)	Rogers (MI)	Skeen	Toomey
Rothman	Smith (MI)	Turner	Barton	Filner	Latham	Rohrabacher	Skelton	Towns
Roukema	Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)	Bass	Flake	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen	Slaughter	Traffant
Roybal-Allard	Smith (TX)	Udall (NM)	Becerra	Fletcher	Leach	Ross	Smith (MI)	Turner
Royce	Snyder	Upton	Bentsen	Foley	Lee	Rothman	Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)
Rush	Solis	Velazquez	Bereuter	Ford	Levin	Roukema	Smith (TX)	Udall (NM)
Ryan (WI)	Souder	Visclosky	Berkley	Fossella	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Upton
Ryun (KS)	Spence	Vitter	Berman	Frank	Lewis (GA)	Royce	Snyder	Velazquez
Sabo	Spratt	Walden	Berry	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)	Rush	Solis	Visclosky
Sanchez	Stark	Walsh	Biggert	Frost	Linder	Ryan (WI)	Souder	Vitter
Sanders	Stearns	Wamp	Bilirakis	Gallegly	Lipinski	Ryun (KS)	Spence	Walden
Sandlin	Stenholm	Waters	Bishop	Ganske	LoBiondo	Sabo	Spratt	Walsh
Sawyer	Strickland	Watkins (OK)	Blagojevich	Gekas	Lofgren	Sanchez	Stark	Wamp
Saxton	Stump	Watson (CA)	Blumenauer	Gilchrest	Lowey	Sanders	Stearns	Waters
Scarborough	Stupak	Watt (NC)	Blunt	Gillmor	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin	Stenholm	Watkins (OK)
Schaffer	Sununu	Watts (OK)	Boehlert	Gilman	Lucas (OK)	Sawyer	Strickland	Watson (CA)
Schakowsky	Tancred	Waxman	Boehner	Gonzalez	Luther	Saxton	Stump	Watt (NC)
Schiff	Tanner	Weiner	Bonilla	Goode	Maloney (CT)	Scarborough	Stupak	Watts (OK)
Schrock	Tauscher	Weldon (FL)	Bonior	Goodlatte	Maloney (NY)	Schaffer	Sununu	Waxman
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Weldon (PA)	Bono	Gordon	Manzullo	Schakowsky	Tancred	Weiner
Serrano	Taylor (MS)	Weller	Borski	Goss	Markey	Schiff	Tanner	Weldon (FL)
Sessions	Taylor (NC)	Wexler	Boswell	Graham	Mascara	Schrock	Tauscher	Weldon (PA)
Shadegg	Terry	Whitfield	Boucher	Granger	Matheson	Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Weller
Shaw	Thomas	Wicker	Boyd	Graves	Matsui	Serrano	Taylor (MS)	Wexler
Shays	Thompson (CA)	Wilson	Brady (PA)	McCarthy (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions	Taylor (NC)	Whitfield
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Wolf	Brady (TX)	Green (WI)	McCollum	Shadegg	Terry	Wicker
Sherwood	Thornberry	Woolsey	Brown (FL)	Greenwood	McCrery	Shaw	Thomas	Wilson
Shimkus	Thune	Wu	Brown (OH)	Grucci	McDermott	Shays	Thompson (CA)	Wolf
Shows	Thurman	Wynn	Brown (SC)	Gutierrez	McGovern	Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Woolsey
Shuster	Tiahrt	Young (AK)	Bryant	Gutknecht	McHugh	Sherwood	Thornberry	Wu
Simmons	Tiberi	Young (FL)	Burr	Hall (OH)	McInnis	Shimkus	Thune	Wynn
Simpson	Tierney		Burton	Hall (TX)	McIntyre	Shows	Thurman	Young (AK)
			Buyer	Hansen	McKeon	Shuster	Tiahrt	Young (FL)
			Callahan	Harman	McKinney			
			Calvert	Hart	McNulty			
			Camp	Hastings (FL)	Meehan			
			Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)			
			Capito	Hayes	Meeks (NY)			
			Capps	Hayworth	Menendez			
			Capuano	Hefley	Mica			
			Cardin	Herger	Millender-			
			Carson (IN)	Hill	McDonald			
			Carson (OK)	Hilleary	Miller (FL)			
			Castle	Hilliard	Miller, Gary			
			Chabot	Hinojosa	Miller, George			
			Chambliss	Hobson	Mink			
			Clay	Hoeffel	Mollohan			
			Clayton	Hoekstra	Moore			
			Clement	Holden	Moran (KS)			
			Clyburn	Holt	Moran (VA)			
			Coble	Honda	Morella			
			Collins	Hooey	Nadler			
			Conbest	Horn	Napolitano			
			Condit	Hostettler	Neal			
			Conyers	Houghton	Nethercutt			
			Cooksey	Hoyer	Ney			
			Costello	Hulshof	Northup			
			Coyne	Hunter	Norwood			
			Cramer	Hyde	Nussle			
			Crane	Inslee	Oberstar			
			Crenshaw	Isakson	Olver			
			Crowley	Israel	Ortiz			
			Culberson	Issa	Osborne			
			Cummings	Istook	Ose			
			Cunningham	Jackson (IL)	Otter			
			Davis (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Owens			
			Davis (FL)	(TX)	Oxley			
			Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Pallone			
			Davis, Jo Ann	Jenkins	Pascarell			
			Deal	John	Pastor			
			DeFazio	Johnson (CT)	Paul			
			DeGette	Johnson (IL)	Payne			
			Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi			
			DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Pence			
			DeLay	Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)			
			DeMint	Kanjorski	Petri			
			Deutsch	Kaptur	Phelps			
			Diaz-Balart	Keller	Pickering			
			Dicks	Kelly	Pitts			
			Dingell	Kennedy (MN)	Platts			
			Doggett	Kennedy (RI)	Pombo			
			Dooley	Kerns	Pomeroy			
			Doolittle	Kildee	Portman			
			Doyle	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)			
			Dreier	Kind (WI)	Pryce (OH)			
			Duncan	King (NY)	Putnam			
			Dunn	Kingston	Quinn			
			Edwards	Kirk	Rahall			
			Ehlers	Klecza	Ramstad			
			Ehrlich	Knollenberg	Rangel			
			Emerson	Kolbe	Regula			
			Engel	Kucinich	Rehberg			
			English	LaFalce	Reyes			
			Eshoo	LaHood	Reynolds			
			Etheridge	Lampson	Riley			
			Evans	Langevin	Rivers			
			Everett	Lantos	Rodriguez			

NOT VOTING—15

Cannon	Gibbons	Obey
Cox	Hinchey	Peterson (PA)
Cubin	Jones (OH)	Scott
Davis, Tom	Manzullo	Smith (WA)
Gephardt	McCarthy (MO)	Sweeney

□ 1845

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 167, agreeing to H. Con. Res. 154, I was detained in my district attending the funeral service of a distinguished civic leader, Kenneth Krakauer. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 163, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 163, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie	Andrews	Baker
Ackerman	Armey	Baldacci
Aderholt	Baca	Baldwin
Akin	Bachus	Ballenger
Allen	Baird	Barcia

NOT VOTING—17

Cannon	Hinchey	Obey
Cox	Hutchinson	Peterson (PA)
Cubin	Jones (OH)	Radanovich
Davis, Tom	McCarthy (MO)	Scott
Gephardt	Murtha	Sweeney
Gibbons	Myrick	

□ 1855

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 168, agreeing to H. Con. Res. 163, I was detained in my district attending the funeral service of a distinguished civic leader, Kenneth Krakauer. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, due to a flight delay from my district, I was unavoidably detained from casting a vote on rollcall No. 166, rollcall No. 167, and rollcall No. 168. Had I been able to take a position, I would have voted in favor of all three rollcalls.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 877

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 877.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2172 AND H.R. 2118

Mr. GREENWOOD. Madam Speaker, on Thursday last week, June 14, 2001, the following cosponsors were incorrectly added to H.R. 2172, and I ask

unanimous consent that they be removed at this time:

FRANK WOLF
MAJOR OWENS
CAROLYN MCCARTHY
FRANK PALLONE
RICHARD NEAL.

Also, the following cosponsors were incorrectly added to H.R. 2118, and I ask unanimous consent that they be removed at this time:

HENRY WAXMAN
MARTIN FROST.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2001

Mr. GREENWOOD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, June 20, 2001, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the following measures: S. 1029, H. Res. 124, H. Res. 168, H.R. 1753, H.R. 819, and S. Con. Res. 41.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

IMPROVING THE HOPE SCHOLARSHIP TAX CREDIT

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, the passage of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 contained a signature initiative, the HOPE Scholarship Tax Credit. The HOPE Scholarship provides annual scholarship benefits to students. However, many of the students who need the most help do not benefit from the program.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and I are introducing legislation that would address these shortcomings. Currently, the HOPE tax credit can be used only for tuition and some expenses. However, college students must pay for much more than just tuition. Our legislation would allow the scholarships to cover required fees, books, supplies and equipment.

Additionally, a student's eligibility is currently reduced by any other grants they receive. As a result, benefits have been limited primarily to middle and upper-middle income taxpayers. That explains why fewer than one-fifth of all full-time students attending community colleges qualify for maximum HOPE Scholarship benefits. Our legislation would ensure that any Pell Grants and other grants a student receives are not counted against the student's eligibility.

Let us help make the HOPE Scholarship available to community college

students. This legislation has bipartisan support and cosponsors, and also support from a number of higher education organizations.

I urge the House to bring up this legislation in the near future.

HOPE SCHOLARSHIP REFORM BILL

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to join with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) in introducing the HOPE Scholarship reform bill.

In April, the Institute for Higher Education Policy issued a report, "Rhetoric and Reality: Effects and Consequence of the HOPE Scholarship." The report concluded, quite simply, that low-income students and students from low-income families do not qualify for the HOPE Scholarship.

It stated that if educational costs to the student beyond tuition and fees could be considered for the HOPE Scholarship, and if low-income students were not penalized for receiving other grants, then more low-income students could enjoy the full benefit of the HOPE Scholarship.

Our bill addresses these exact issues. Our bill ensures that students are not penalized for receiving Pell Grants or SEOG grants. It also ensures that the costs of required fees, books, supplies and equipment can be included as part of the eligible HOPE Scholarship expenses. Our bill expands access to higher education, it expands opportunity to higher education, and it expands the affordability of higher education.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the HOPE Scholarship reform bill.

CALIFORNIA ENERGY PROBLEMS THE FAULT OF CALIFORNIA

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, anybody that gets frustrated with a utility company, I am completely sympathetic with. But I have to stay, I think it is a little immature of the Governor of California to continuously blame power companies for some of their problems out there.

Just think about this: The State of California in the last 10 years had unprecedented prosperity and growth, and during that period of time, they, like any other growing municipality or entity, would add new schools, new roads, new hospitals; but when it came time to approve new power plant construction, oh, no, we cannot do that.

□ 1900

We are going to defy the law of supply and demand. What were they thinking? Grow up. They have to add to

their infrastructure power. They cannot have a 25 percent increase in demand and only increase the supply 6 percent. It is as if Governor Davis has the key to the power that they need for hospitals, for schools, for learning, for lights, and even the gasoline for going places in one's car. It is like he has the key to it and he is throwing it away so that the lowly working folks, in his opinion, the middle class, cannot function.

Madam Speaker, I would say, let the key go and open up the supply, Governor Davis.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT OF MISSOURI RIVER WILL LEAD TO FLOODING, ECONOMIC DEVASTATION, AND UNSAFE ENVIRONMENT FOR COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we are fond of looking back over our country's relatively short history and commemorating noteworthy events. For instance, in a few short years, in 2004, our country will be celebrating the bicentennial anniversary of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Some will take that opportunity and look back with nostalgia and wistfully wish that we could turn the clock back and restore the great Missouri River to its natural condition of 200 years ago.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, some strong political activists, including the newly minted Senate majority leader, have been forcefully advocating for a change in the management of the Missouri River. These individuals or entities are pushing legislation insisting on manipulating higher water flows in the spring months, called a spring rise, and lower flows in the late summer. Now, environmentalists claim that such a controlled flood is necessary to accommodate two endangered and one threatened species.

Those from the Upper Missouri River Basin, like the senior Senator from South Dakota, support this plan because it would help the multimillion dollar recreation industry. Members of this alliance have been reassuring Missourians all along that a controlled flood in the springtime will be no big deal, that somehow our concerns on the lower river basin are inconsequential or invalid.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this arrogance is not just limited to interest groups outside of Washington. I contacted a high-level government official in mid-May regarding continued concerns about

flooding, about economic devastation, and constituent safety. The reply I got from this government official: "A spring rise will only result in some inconvenience."

Well, apparently in the minds of some, the habitat of two birds and one fish take precedence over the homes of 22,500 families who live alongside the Missouri River Basin.

I want to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, what has happened over the last 2½ weeks. On June 1, the Missouri River was at 13 feet, which is normal. Due to heavy rainfall up-river on June the 8, 7 days later, the river stage was at an astounding 29 feet. That is a 16 foot rise in elevation a week. Now, for those of us unfamiliar with river towns or river terminology, flood stage is when a channel is full and damage begins to occur. So in these short 7 days, the Missouri River went from normal levels to 8 feet above flood stage.

Now, fortunately not a lot of damage occurred because there is adequate structural flood protection that is built to withstand flows under the current management plan. But I shudder to think what would have happened if the proposed controlled flood plan had been in effect, because once the decision is made on the up-river to release water from those up-river reservoirs, it cannot be stopped, and it takes 8 to 10 days to finally get down to the point of the confluence at St. Louis. That man-made spring rise, coupled with the heavy rainfall we saw during this 7-day period provided by Mother Nature, would have been, in my estimation, economically devastating and potentially life-threatening.

While the up-river recreation industry would have been congratulating themselves, shaking hands and heading off to the bank, Missourians would have been consoling themselves, holding hands, stranded on top of their rooftops.

To those who would have us return to the romantic times of 1804, let me say that Missouri scientists and biologists from our own State Department of Natural Resources believe that a spring rise in the flow of the Missouri River would not improve the habitat restoration of the pallid sturgeon, of the least tern, and the piping plover. In fact, according to the Army Corps of Engineers, the cost to accommodate these three species through changing the management of the Missouri River system would be \$1 billion over 20 years. We are already helping species restoration through effective and less costly mitigation efforts.

In addition, if low-summer flows, the second component of this plan were instituted, commercial navigation would be severely interrupted not only in the Missouri River, but on the lower Mississippi River region, and hydroelectric power generation would be lost.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of Members of this House in Congress have agreed with Missourians on this issue. In fact, they have been over-

whelmingly with us over the past 5 years. In fact, I see my friend from Iowa here and I applaud his efforts today in the House Agricultural Committee on Appropriations which included an amendment that would restrict funding for the Fish and Wildlife Service if such spring rise and split navigation zones were implemented.

I want to tell all of my colleagues in this House, Mr. Speaker, how deeply that we Missourians appreciate the support, especially because of recent developments in the Senate, and that we may need their undaunted courage in the very near future.

A DISCUSSION OF IMPORTANT ISSUES FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, today we passed a resolution to honor our troops in Bosnia. I personally want to thank the National Guard troops, our men and women in uniform. I want to especially recognize them today because they spend time away from their families and their jobs.

I know this because I have a neighbor in my hometown of Prescott, Arkansas, Kevin Smith, who is serving tonight in Bosnia through the National Guard while his wife remains home, pregnant, and continues to hold down a job. Our families make huge sacrifices so our men and women in the National Guard can serve our country and yes, serve Bosnia in this time of need and they do so with honor and dignity and I want to thank each and every one of them.

This is especially important to me because I have two National Guard units from my district, one from Magnolia and another from Sheridan, that are presently serving in Bosnia. My legislative assistant for military affairs has been there to visit with the troops. I wish I could have gone, but it was at a time when we had votes going on here in our Nation's capital. So I want to thank all of them. I want to thank them for this important service to our country and to Bosnia during this time of need.

Today we celebrate Juneteenth, something else that is important to me that I would like to visit with my colleagues about this evening. On this date in 1865, Major General Gordon Granger lead his troops into Galveston, Texas and officially proclaimed freedom for slaves for the State of Texas, concluding a 2½ year journey through the Deep South. Today I join African Americans and citizens of all races across Arkansas, across America, and across the world in celebrating Juneteenth in honor of the Emancipation Proclamation signed by President Abraham Lincoln and Major General Granger's historic journey. African Americans have played an important role throughout America's history

and we should all be grateful for their many, many contributions to our society.

Mr. Speaker, as we gather today with family, friends and neighbors in marking the tradition of Juneteenth, I extend my warmest wishes for a special celebration, one that we will remember, and I ask all citizens to renew our commitment to a nation that stands for civil justice and opportunity for all people.

Finally, this evening I would like to visit for a few minutes on the issue of energy. Mr. Speaker, as temperatures across the country heat up and this summer's travel season begins, our Nation finds itself in the midst of an energy crisis like one that has not been seen in 2 decades. While my constituents in south Arkansas have not had to face the electricity shortages that California has seen, like all Americans, they have been strapped by the dramatic rise in oil and gas prices.

The hardworking families of south Arkansas already struggle to make ends meet. Many of my constituents come from poor and rural areas where they depend on their cars or trucks to get to and from their jobs, oftentimes traveling many miles, or where they have large tractors and equipment to tend to their family farms. When already faced with the cost of feeding their families, paying their electricity bills, and paying for expensive prescription drugs to stay healthy and get well, they simply cannot afford these high gasoline costs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must act to bring these prices down, and we must do it now. Since this most recent increase in gasoline prices began, I, along with many of my colleagues in Congress, have written letters to energy Secretary Spencer Abraham as well as President Bush asking them to come to the aid of gasoline consumers by aggressively lobbying OPEC, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, to increase the production of oil or, as President Bush suggested last year, "open up their spigots" to help alleviate this problem, this crisis.

Just last March, OPEC decided arbitrarily to cut oil production by 4 percent in the countries that our men and women in uniform went to serve in Desert Storm. That is one million barrels a day.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for OPEC to do right by the American consumers. It is time for OPEC to do right by the consumers of south Arkansas. Increase production, increase production now.

In addition to pressuring OPEC to increase production, we must also work with U.S. oil producers to increase their dangerously low levels of oil inventories. Our nation lacks the refinery capacity to keep up with current demand for oil and gas. We should work to streamline regulatory requirements to facilitate investment in new refineries and other improvements to our energy infrastructure, and I urge the Administration to work with our current domestic refineries to increase their inventories of refined gasoline.

But we cannot stop there. We need a balanced, proactive national energy policy—one that serves as an energy plan for the future that not only increases energy production, but also decreases energy demand. We must work to decrease our dependence on foreign oil through conservation, renewable energy, and energy efficiency programs.

In the short term, we should look at ways to guard our consumers against potential price gouging by the big oil companies. For our home heating oil consumers, we should also look at incentives to encourage consumers to make energy efficient improvements to their homes, and we must make sure that we fully fund the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). The money we invest in this program will be put right back into the economy through lower heating and fuel bills.

In May, President Bush announced his Administration's plan to address our nation's current energy crisis, a plan for that calls for major increases in oil and gas production in the United States. I agree with the Administration that we need to increase production, but I believe their proposal is a plan for the past that seems to cater to the big oil companies.

I am disappointed that their plan does not do more to support programs to increase research and development in new energy technologies that increase conservation and alternative and renewable fuel sources to reduce our oil dependence. This may not be an immediate answer, but it is certainly important for the long-term as fossil fuel sources diminish. Surely, if we can create the technology to send a man to the moon, we can develop a crop that our farmers can grow that can provide an efficient and affordable alternative source for fuel.

Our current energy situation is a complicated problem with no easy answers, but it is of critical importance to the people of south Arkansas and across America. The sooner we take action, the sooner we can see results at the pump. I urge my colleagues to support a balanced, proactive, and bipartisan solution to this crisis so that we can bring relief to our hard working families.

A TRIBUTE TO FIREFIGHTER JOHN J. DOWNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to express my deepest sympathies and that of a grateful community to the Downing family and to pay honor and tribute to a true American hero, firefighter John J. Downing of Port Jefferson Station, New York.

On June 17, 2001, John Downing and 350 of his fellow firefighters and numerous police officers responded to a 2:19 p.m. call to a 911 that sent them to Long Island General Supply Company in Queens, New York. As is always the case, these brave men and women responded without reservation and with little or no regard for their personal safety. By 3 p.m., the blaze had gone to 5 alarms, and the fire and explosion had turned the 128-year-old Long Island

General Supply Company into a horrific scene.

□ 1915

By 8 p.m. the fire had been controlled, but at a tragic cost: three firefighters lost their lives. Additionally, two civilians and dozens of firefighters were injured.

The three brave men were firefighters John J. Downing of Port Jefferson Station, from Ladder Company 163; Harry Ford, of Long Beach; and Brian Fahey of East Rockaway, both of Rescue 4 unit.

My constituent, John Downing, leaves his wife of 11 years; a daughter, Joanne; and a son, Michael. John Downing was one of seven children from Woodside. He went to elementary school at St. Sebastian School in Woodside, and then to high school in St. Francis Preparatory School in Fresh Meadows. He later went on to work in the construction field before becoming a firefighter 11 years ago.

John Downing and all three of his brothers gave back to the community through public service. He and his brother Denis both became firefighters, Denis Downing now at Ladder Company 160 in Long Island City, and James and Joseph Downing are New York City police officers.

Everyone who knew John called him a hero in every sense of the word. Every day he was on the job for the past 11 years as a firefighter. John always gave his all and did his best. Whether it was in fighting fires or helping young firefighters to learn their job better, everyone in the firehouse knew they could count on John.

Knowing this, it was no surprise when firefighter Downing appeared on the front pages of the New York Daily News 3 years ago. He was pictured on the front page as a hero once again, rescuing passengers from a commercial jet that had gone off the runway at LaGuardia Airport and into the chilling waters of Flushing Bay.

Firefighting was not John's entire life, though. He was a family man, dotting over his two children and devoted to his wife. In recent weeks he had been working a second job to bring his family on their first real summer vacation to Ireland, to visit the relatives of his family and his wife's. Sadly, when the alarm for his last fire came, John was 2 hours away from ending his shift and beginning that vacation.

As the alarm went off, John put down the study book he had been reading, preparing to take the exam to become a lieutenant in the fire department. He grabbed his gear, and with the last full measure of devotion and commitment, John and his colleagues answered their last call.

Today John and his colleagues are in the loving embrace of God. I ask my colleagues to please join me in extending our deepest sympathies to the families of these three brave heroes and in recognizing the brave sacrifices of a true hero, John J. Downing.

CHANGE IN ENERGY REGULATION POLICY BY THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION COINCIDES WITH SWITCH IN CONTROL OF U.S. SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission found that the prices being charged for power in the western United States were neither just nor reasonable. The law would require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to then take action to both lower the prices and to order rebates for market manipulation, price-gouging, price-fixing that was going on.

But under the leadership of Mr. Hebert, chair of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, appointed by President Bush, FERC did nothing. They said there was not really a problem, this was just the market sending us a signal. What was the signal? Billions of dollars extracted from ratepayers, residential ratepayers, small business and big businesses alike; rolling blackouts and brownouts in California; incredibly high wholesale prices in the Pacific Northwest, with prices up to one hundred times, one hundred times what was charged just 2 years ago in the wholesale market.

But it also meant up to 1,000 percent, a 1,000 percent increase in profits for a handful of energy companies, most of whom happened to be based in Texas, and most of whom happened to be very generous contributors both to this administration and to the majority party in this House.

Mr. Hebert said no action was necessary, that he would do nothing. At one meeting, he opined that he would pray for us; faith-based regulation, I guess. But something changed all of a sudden; being stonewalled for months and months; his own staff saying the law was being violated; being sued; being petitioned by Members of Congress, by constituents, businesses desperate for relief.

On Monday they held an emergency meeting. What changed? What could have brought that about? Did they finally read their own staff reports, finally recognize the market manipulation? No, what changed is one vote in the United States Senate. Suddenly, there were committees in the Senate with the capability of investigating what was going on, and they scheduled hearings for tomorrow to bring in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to have the chairman explain how it is his staff found things to be unjust and unreasonable, but he said that there was no problem.

Under that threat, they have adopted some half measures; better than nothing, but not much. They are going to peg prices to the least efficient, the most expensive unit, most obsolete

generating unit operating. It is better than what has been going on today, with prices up to \$4,000 a megawatt hour. Maybe we will get it down to \$200 or \$300. That is still ten times what the market provided for just 2 years ago.

They will extend it across the entire western United States, which will offer some relief to my part of the country in the Pacific Northwest.

They did admit the price-gouging and market manipulation had gone on and that refunds were due, but they set up some sort of voluntary settlement process to try and extract the billions of dollars back from these Texas-based energy conglomerates.

That is not going to work. They need to use their authority to order the refunds, and they need to set the amount of the refunds.

Then, finally, they said it would only last through a year from next October; that is, two summers for California, two peak seasons, but only one peak season for my part of the country. This will still cost consumers hundreds of millions, ultimately billions of dollars more than they need to pay to have reliable energy in the western U.S. It will still put untold hundreds of millions and billions of dollars into the pockets of market manipulators. It is just that the profits will not be a 1,000 percent increase anymore, it might only be a 200 percent increase or 300 percent increase for those companies based in Texas who have been contributing so generously to the majority party in this administration.

But they had to do something, because they might lose their whole scam, their whole game. The heart of it is deregulation. Deregulation does not work in a monopoly environment. It does not work when there are a few plants and one big set of transmission wires that runs down to smaller wires that run to our house.

How are we going to have competition? Competition could never work, will never work in this industry. It is a vital public necessity. For more than 60 years we regulated in this country because of the collapse the last time we played with deregulation in the United States, back in the 1920s.

It is time to return to regulation. But short of that, it is time for effective cost-based caps on power, something that runs for 2 years and something that orders that rebates be done. We should not accept in this House these half-measures by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in their desperate attempt to save themselves from being embarrassed in having to testify before the United States Senate.

ANGOLA, INDIANA PROVIDES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES TO CITIZENS, AND SUCCESSFUL HIGH SCHOOL SENIOR YEAR EXPERIENCE TO A DIVERSITY OF STUDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, Angola is a town in my district of 67,000 people in northeast Indiana, and it has become a hot zone for economic development, and will become ever more so in the upcoming years.

Obviously, a hard-working work force is important, but that has been there since the founding. Interstate 80/90, better known as the Indiana Toll Road, and Interstate 69 intersect just north of town, which has been a longtime asset of this area.

Angola, Indiana has further capitalized on its natural resource assets. Lake James and many other lakes in the area have long been a draw for many people who want to live in an environment where they can be surrounded by lakes and various recreation opportunities.

By connecting Pokagon State Park to the newly-built YMCA and to its unique Monument Circle with a bike path, area residents are offered increasing health and recreation alternatives.

What has given Angola a further edge is the educational collaboration of Tri-State University, Angola High School, and now the new Plastics Technology Center. Yesterday I was with Steve Corona of JobWorks, Inc., and Craig Adolph and Harry Adamson of the plastics center to announce a grant of \$514,000.

To some, this may seem like the rich are getting richer. Angola has a lot of advantages. The truth is, Angola is not a wealthy town. It is basically mid-America or maybe even slightly below in income, but they are organized. They have been rising because they have been able to coordinate several things that in fact have become the keys to economic development: the recreation opportunities, the lifestyle opportunities, combined with good transportation, a good work force, and increasingly, a well-trained and educated work force.

One of the things that Angola provides is a continuum of education efforts. Whether the student decides to go into the work force directly after high school, enter a 2-year vocational program or community college program, or whether they are going to attend a 4-year university or just continue life-long learning or specific training that is not degree-driven, it is a real-world option.

To employers, this means that students are being prepared for real-world jobs. Too often, our education is generic. Many job training programs at times seem to be marginally useful. It is easy to criticize our schools when they get things wrong, and we frequently do it from this floor.

At Angola High School, they are getting things right. I visited their effective Safe and Drug-Free Schools program. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, it has been frustrating to see a lot of programs that do not work. This is one that has worked.

They have a great high-tech program which is innovative at the State and national level. They consistently win the State music programs over the last few years. I am proud that it is in my district, but let me give the Members a couple of examples that illustrate why and what I mean by this.

The principal was quoted in this article, and the article reiterates that the U.S. Department of Education has singled out Angola as the "new American high school," and the principal is one of only two high school principals on the National Commission on the High School Senior Year national study. The Indiana Association of Teacher Educators in 1998 and 1996 picked Angola as Indiana's most outstanding high school.

One of the things they have done for the high school seniors is a workplace participation program. About 40 businesses and industries in Steuben County have developed a 9-week workplace curriculum. The high school's flexible four-block schedule allows students time to travel by bus to their workplaces.

Let me give a couple of examples. One student at Angola, Todd Hack, is further along in his college career than some college freshmen. He will start at Tri-State University with 26 hours of credits earned from advanced placement courses and computer classes he took on campus. The flexible schedule allowed him to move ahead, so he was able to stay in school and, because he was an advanced student, get a college education.

Another student, Greg Knauer, worked 30 hours a week in his senior year at a construction firm earning hours towards his journeyman's license. He hopes to begin an apprenticeship after graduation, another type of career path.

Yet another student, Amy Dennis, was interested in nursing, but did not have a family member to show her the ropes. Her workplace participation took her to Cameron Memorial Community Hospital, where she followed every clinical rotation. She will study nursing at Indiana University-Purdue University in Fort Wayne, or IPFW or the University of St. Francis next fall, and hopes to become an obstetrics nurse.

Yet another student will participate in a Cisco computer program in which two high schools in my district have hooked up, and when finished, he will be certified to build up a network system from ground up. He is planning to attend Cornell or MIT, his early picks, and he is confident his high school record, near perfect SAT scores, will make them take notice.

This is how high school should work, where we have the range of students, a diversity of students: one here, one going into construction, one into nursing at college, one into an advanced placement program, and one to an Ivy League school.

I want to congratulate Angola, and I am proud to represent them.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following articles from the Fort Wayne Journal Gazette and the News-Sun and Evening Star of Auburn and Angola.

The articles referred to are as follows:

IS HIGH SCHOOL SENIOR YEAR A WASTE OF TIME?

(By Karen Francisco)

Senioritis symptoms are at the full-blown stage. Mortar boards and gowns in hand, scores of high school seniors are impatiently marking time, waiting for the chance to slam the door on childhood and rush headlong into life.

But are they ready? Have they spent the past nine months preparing for what lies beyond, or have they been stuck in an antiquated educational system that allots 12 years of schooling for 11 years of knowledge?

The National Commission on the High School Senior Year considered the question. It arrived at the conclusion that "The nation faces a deeply troubling future unless we transform the lost opportunity of the senior year into an integral part of students' preparation for life, citizenship, work and further education."

In his charge to the commission, former U.S. Secretary of Education Robert Riley described the senior year as a "wasteland," a year of "significant drift and disconnection."

The panel's final report will be released June 28, and it will likely create a stir not unlike 1983's landmark "A Nation at Risk" report, according to Dr. Rex Bolinger, principal at Angola High School and one of just two high school principals on the high-powered commission. Look for a sweeping indictment of the structure of U.S. high schools.

INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS

Bolinger points to a number of problems with the typical American high school and its role in the education spectrum. First and foremost might be its inflexibility.

"We've allowed learning to be the variable and time and support the constant," Bolinger said. "The opposite is what is needed."

He cited the example of students following a math curriculum without regard to their own interests and abilities. Students are passed along, and when they begin to struggle, they simply choose not to take any more math classes. Inflexible six- or seven-period schedules discourage students from retaking courses they haven't mastered.

American students don't perform as well as students from other industrialized countries on math and science exams because our high school curricula allow them to opt out of advanced courses like calculus and chemistry long before their counterparts, the principal said.

"The message we've got to get out is that whatever you plan to do after you get out of high school, we've all got to have the same rigorous preparation," Bolinger said.

Another problem with the typical high school is the sorting process, according to the principal. Unwittingly, some teachers and systems sort and label students as college prep, general ed or vocational. The labels stick, and students who might have dis-

covered a passionate interest in art, literature or computers are dismissed as non-college types. Disenfranchised, they lose interest in school and are at risk to drop out.

ANGOLA IS MODEL

Bolinger's own school could be a model for how high school should work. It has been singled out by the U.S. Department of Education as a "New American High School," and by the Indiana Association of Teacher Educators in 1996 and '98 as Indiana's "Most Outstanding Successful High School."

The school's evolution began about six years ago, when Bolinger and some business and education leaders began talking about how to prepare students for jobs in the community. The result was the Workplace Participation Program. About 40 businesses and industries in Steuben County have developed a nine-week workplace curriculum. The high school's flexible four-block schedule allows students time to travel by bus to the workplaces.

"The curriculum is simple to prepare," Bolinger said. "We tell them, 'Write down what you do and teach them.'"

And the students are learning.

Joe Dolack is a senior who transferred to Angola from Illinois his sophomore year. He repeated a math class to catch up on academics, and then began participating in the workplace program at General Products Corp., an automotive components supplier. His grade-point average has risen three points on a 12-point scale and he plans to attend community college in Coldwater, Mich., before transferring to a four-year school. A career in manufacturing management is his goal.

Senator Amy Dennis was interested in nursing, but didn't have a family member to show her the ropes. Her workplace participation took her to Cameron Memorial Community Hospital, where she followed every clinical rotation. She will study nursing at Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne or the University of St. Francis next fall, and hopes to become an obstetrics nurse.

It was a job in the building trades that enticed Greg Knauer. He has worked 30 hours a week during his senior year at Ingledue Construction, earning hours toward his journeyman's license. He hopes to begin an apprenticeship in construction after graduation.

Angola senior Todd Hack is further along in his college career than some college freshman. He'll start at Tri-State University this fall with 26 hours of credit earned from Advanced Placement courses and computer classes he took on campus. The flexible schedule at Angola allowed him to move ahead, Hack said, while still finishing high school requirements and participating in three sports.

Amy Enneking, also a senior, is convinced she wants to teach after spending her workplace participation hours in a first-grade classroom at Hendry Park Elementary School. She will study elementary education at Butler University this fall.

Chris DeLucenay is still a junior, but his career goals are clear.

"I knew I wanted an aggressive schedule," he said. "I'm interested in computers and engineering, so I've taken calculus at Tri-State and two Advanced Placement courses."

He will participate next year in the Cisco computer program and, when finished, will be certified to build a network system from the ground up. Cornell and MIT are his early college picks, and he's confident his high school record (and near-perfect SAT scores) will make them take notice.

A TEAM EFFORT

Craig Adolph, an Angola education consultant who has been involved in the school

program since its inception, said the most remarkable thing about recent Angola graduates is their focus. All seem to have a clear idea of what they want to do and how to do it.

For the community's part, Adolph said, the job is to keep people in touch with learning so they never are reluctant to return to college or a job-training program.

Dr. Tom Enneking, vice president for academic affairs at Ti-State, said the key was to develop a seamless delivery system for education. His school had previously offered an early admissions program, but the partnership with Angola High School allowed it to build on the Advanced Placement courses, easily bridging the high school to college gap that some students fail to cross.

THE JOB AHEAD

Bolinger said the transformation of American high schools was one step in a bigger task—building an infrastructure that supports lifelong learning, instead of one that starts and stops in uneven intervals between preschool and adulthood.

The first step—creating high schools that work—won't come easily, Bolinger said, but he's hopeful the national commission's recommendations will spur progress. A report that challenges the fundamental structure of American education is a sharp departure from the current testing and standards hysteria, but the principal said he is hopeful for its prospects because of bipartisan support and the interest of Rod Paige, who was a member of the commission until he replaced Riley as secretary of education.

Bolinger said some parents have accused his school—with its emphasis on career training and college courses—of pushing students out the door. The opposite is true, he said. Rather than constraining students to a rigid, cookie-cutter model, a high school schedule should promote independence and self-exploration. The old model served us well for many years, the principal said, but a new American high school is what's needed for a new century.

STUDY'S FINDINGS

Selected findings from the National Commission on the High School Senior Year:

A high school diploma is no longer a guarantee of success in either postsecondary education or the world of work.

The goal of the American high school needs to be reoriented from preparing some students for college and others for work.

The conditions of modern life require that all students graduate from high school with the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in both postsecondary education and careers.

"The tyranny of low expectations" hinders many minority students and many poor students from all ethnic backgrounds.

Ideally, beginning in the middle school years, every student would have a "learning plan," a formal but flexible outline of what the student hopes to accomplish in young adulthood and which education, work and service experiences can best help him or her to attain those goals.

The kindergarten-12 system is poorly aligned and has not established reliable lines of communication with postsecondary education and the world of work. The National Commission on the High School Senior Year (www.commissiononthesenioryear.org)

GRANT TO PAY FOR TRAINING PLASTICS WORKERS

(By Yvonne Paske)

Angola—That attractive structure next to the Breeden YMCA and Learning Center on Angola's northeast side isn't just for show.

The Plastics Technology Center will continue on its course to train a work force on

state-of-the-art plastics technology for jobs in Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Illinois, thanks to a \$514,550 U.S. Department of Labor grant.

Collaborators on the grant, U.S. Rep. Mark Souder, R-Ind., Steve Corona of JobWorks Inc., Harry Adamson, Plastics Technology Center director, and Craig Adolph of the Cole Foundation, made the announcement at the Plastics Technology Center Monday.

The grant was requested in January and awarded Friday, Adolph said. A curriculum and courses may be in place as soon as this summer or fall to train workers on specific machinery allowing some to step into jobs earning them \$40,000 a year, he said.

The training is available to workers in the Indiana counties of Noble and DeKalb, as well as Steuben, Souder said. It also is open to Williams County, Ohio, and Branch, Hillsdale and St. Joseph counties of Michigan.

The training will be free, as the grant will pick up the cost, Adamson said. To date, he has hired no project manager, although the coordinating process with other workplaces has begun.

In opening comments, Souder characterized Steuben County as a spot on the cusp of becoming an industrial magnet due to job training, exceptional schools, natural beauty, recreational options and advantageous transportation routes.

"This is clearly a hot zone for Indiana," he said. "The rolling hills, the interstate structure, the lakes. ... That's why we work to get money for the airport expansion, a bypass around Angola, the bike path. ... It all makes a positive ambience for industrial recruitment, and in the middle of it you have a technology center."

He praised Angola High School's advanced use of technology, its partnership with Tri-State University and its school-to-workplace program and emphasized those assets work together to train and keep a available work force in Steuben County.

"The Plastics Technology Center can help Angola High School reach out," he said. "The companies ultimately with this grant can help meet the increasing demands for mid-tech workers and keep them here. This is for people in high school who recognize everyone will not go to college. We're retraining the work force. This will help northeast Indiana further along the path for an enhanced quality of life."

Corona credited the interaction between Adolph and Adamson, the facility itself, the coordination with work force systems in the tri-state area and the training curriculum for the nod on the grant.

"We expect to serve 1,000 people over the next 24 month period. ... Research shows around 100 plastics plants in Michigan and Indiana (alone)," he said.

"That's what higher education in the U.S. and Indiana is about," Adolph said. "We're going to keep our students here. We are out in front, and with these people's help, we're going to stay there."

Adamson said the center will help Steuben County compete in a global environment. Training for students, incumbent and dislocated workers will mean higher productivity, said the 30-year veteran of the plastics industry.

Adamson led those assembled on a tour of the center, including a visit to the computer lab, where students learn industrial software packages in the center's Cisco Academy. "Here students are trained on the simulation models, individually, at their own speed," he said.

He also showed off the actual plastics machinery upon which students will train, calling it "the latest, the highest" in technology. The machinery and lab were donated by companies on six-month leases, and com-

puters procured through a \$50,000 U.S. Department of Agriculture grant written by Adolph.

"We're looking at concrete, bottom-line dollars here," Adamson said. "These people will be trained—you don't need to call a more skilled person."

Souder spoke to the environmental issues and impact attendant upon courting industry and plastics plants while touting the area's unspoiled natural beauty.

"First off, why are companies moving toward plastics?" he queried. "Because they want cleaner air, and people want higher gas mileage, which lighter, plastic parts (can give). As we move toward more biodegradable plastics, the manufacturing impact is less, as opposed to steel mills. Plastics also have some of the cleaner software jobs because we'll have applied sciences. ... I know this is a sensitive issue in a lakes area. Plastics isn't the cleanest (industry), but it's among them," he said. He pointed to University of Notre Dame research developing reduced air pollution techniques in relation to plastics manufacturing.

Adolph indicated plastics may be the tip of the iceberg in recruiting business to the area.

"With training and with Tri-State as a partner, we ... should be able to attract other technology-based industries as well," he said. "This building can be enhanced, so plastics is just the first large manufacturer."

WE CANNOT HAVE A FREE SOCIETY WITHOUT PRIVATE PROPERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, John A. Rapanos owned a 175-acre tract of land a few miles west of Bay City, Michigan. He cut some timber, removed the stumps, and brought in a considerable quantity of sand as fill.

Now, this was on his own private property. However, the Michigan State government ruled that 29 acres contained wetlands, and a federal permit should have been obtained first. Mr. Rapanos was indicted, convicted, and the judge reluctantly imposed a \$185,000 fine, put him on probation for 3 years, and required 200 hours of community service.

□ 1930

Then a few months ago, the 6th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals reversed the judge, because incredibly they said he had given Mr. Rapanos too lenient a sentence.

Mr. Speaker, when something like this can take place, I wonder if we really live in a free country any more. The judge whom the 6th Circuit unbelievably found to be too lenient said at one point, "I don't know if it's just a coincidence that I just sentenced Mr. Gonzales, a person selling dope on the streets of the United States. He is an illegal person here. He's not an American citizen. He has a prior criminal record. So here we have a person who comes to the United States and commits crimes of selling dope, and the government asks me to put him in prison for 10 months. And then we have an

American citizen who buys land, pays for it with his own money, and he moves some sand from one end to the other and the government wants me to give him 63 months in prison."

And the judge said, "Now, if that isn't our system gone crazy, I don't know what is. And I am not going to do it."

Of course, he was reversed. This story was told in a recent column by nationally syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick entitled, "Wetlands Case Shows Government Run Amok."

Mr. Speaker, we can never satisfy government's appetite for money or land. If we gave every Department or agency up here twice what they are getting, they might be happy for a short time; but they would very soon be back to us crying about a shortfall of funds.

Now, the Federal Government owns slightly over 30 percent of the land in this country and State and local governments and quasigovernmental entities own another 20 percent, half the land in some type of public ownership; but they always want more.

And the two most disturbing things are, one, the rapid rate at which government has increased its taking in the last 30 years or 40 years; and, two, the growing number of restrictions, rules, regulations, and red tape the government is applying to the land that is left in private hands.

And some very left-wing environmental extremists are even promoting something called the Wildlands Project with the goal of taking half the land that is left in private hands and making it public. No one seems to get concerned until it is their land that is being taken or their home.

Talk about urban sprawl, if you feel overcrowded now, wait until the government takes half the private land that is left.

Already, there is so little private land that is still developable in many areas that builders are forced to build houses on postage-stamp size lots.

Fairfax County, Virginia, recently had a man placed in jail for about 3 months because he had the audacity to put a golf driving range on his own land in competition with a county government driving range.

He even spent huge money, I believe it was over \$100,000, placing trees and complying with all sorts of ridiculous requirements; but when they told him he was going to have to spend many more thousands more to move trees they had ordered him to put in in the first place and basically undo what they ordered him to do, he fought back.

I ask again, Mr. Speaker, is this still a free country?

The Nobel Prize winning economist Milton Friedman said, "You cannot have a free society without private property."

Linda Bowles, a national syndicated columnist, a few days ago in a column entitled, "Endangered Species versus Farmers," wrote this, "In his 1992 best

seller, 'The Way Things Ought To Be,' Rush Limbaugh wrote, 'With the collapse of Marxism, environmentalism has become the new refuge of socialist thinking. The environment is a great way to advance a political agenda that favors central planning and an intrusive government. What better way to control someone's property than to subordinate one's private property rights to environmental concerns.'"

Ms. Bowles said at the time, this sounded like hyperbole, but it was not. Limbaugh's warning was worthy and prophetic. I realized this a few years ago when I came across a story concerning a farmer in Kern County, California, who was arrested for allegedly running over an endangered kangaroo rat while tilling his own land. His tractor was seized and held for 4 months, and he faced a year in jail and a \$200,000 fine.

As time has passed, it is now clear, Ms. Bowles said, what happened to the farmer in Kern County was not an anomaly, but part of a developing pattern of government invasion of private rights.

On April 7, 2001, the federal government's Bureau of Reclamation cut off irrigation water to 1,500 family farms in the Klamath Basin on the Oregon-California border. Based on "citizen lawsuits" filed by environmental activists, all the available water will go to save fish, primarily the sucker fish. A federal judge denied an appeal by the farmers saying, "Congress has spoken in the plainest of words, making it abundantly clear that the balance has been struck in favor of affording endangered species the highest of priorities."

While the farmers are going bankrupt, the legal bills of the environmentalists are paid for by the American taxpayers under the "citizen lawsuit" provisions of the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Speaker if we don't soon start putting people and private property before sucker fish and kangaroo rats, it is us who will be the suckers and we will lose our freedom and prosperity.

Meanwhile, based on a successful lawsuit filed by the Earth, Justice Legal Defense Fund, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has just designated 4.1 million acres as critical habitats for the endangered California red-legged frog. Nearly 70 percent of the acres are private property.

The protected habitats hopscotch across 28 California counties, including key agricultural counties, adding layers of new regulations on already over-regulated private land. No activity of any kind on this land will be permitted until it has been proven that such activity will in no way affect the well-being of the beloved red-legged frog.

Another endangered critter wreaking damage in California is the fairy shrimp, which thrives in what environmentalists call "vernal pools" and what ordinary folk call standing water or mud puddles. Anyway, when these puddles evaporate, the fairy shrimp eggs nest in the mud until the next seasonal rains hatch them.

Apparently the deal is this: if you drain or spray standing water, you get an award from the mosquito control people and a summons from the fairy shrimp police.

The protection of these "vernal pools" is a nightmare to California farmers, developers, and even local governments. For example, environmental concerns for the shrimp cost Fresno County a six-month, \$250,000 delay in the construction of an important freeway. However, that's cheap compared to the undisclosed cost of moving the site of a major new University of California campus in Merced, Calif., because there are too many vernal pools on it.

California is the nation's largest producer of food crops and commodities, including fruits, nuts, vegetables, melons, livestock and dairy products. This massive agricultural industry depends entirely on irrigation for water. In California, rainfall is slight or non-existent from early May to mid-October.

Land regulations, fuel costs and electrical shortages are disastrous to farmers. But the most critical issue for them and for all Californians is water. The eco-inspired ban on the construction of dams and water storage facilities to catch the runoff from winter rains and spring snow melts is limiting the supply of water even as demand for it is surging. It is a disaster in the making. *Deja vu!*

While there is local outrage in California and elsewhere over these abuses, there is little national outrage. One hopes this is due to a lack of coverage by the mainstream media, rather than a fatalistic American submission to state socialism. One fears that only in retrospect, when it is too late to resist, will it be understood that freedoms have been irretrievably forfeited and the Constitution irreversibly abandoned.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to highlight the health care needs of our communities throughout this country. I am deeply concerned with the lack of attention that the House leadership and the administration has paid, not just to managed-care reform, but to health care as a whole.

Every day, millions of Americans suffer from diseases that we could prevent, diseases we could treat, diseases that we could cure. But we have not made the commitment to take care of that.

We must not let them down. In this Special Order tonight, we look at the Patients' Bill of Rights, as well as the issue of health care.

It is time for us to also consider the fact that there are a lot of individuals out there who are sick and that need our assistance, and we must not forget them.

We hear so much about values, and the greatest value I know is helping those who need the assistance. And who needs the assistance more than those afflicted with the diseases of the body and of the mind?

There is no doubt that this particular issue is an issue that continues to

haunt us and is an issue that as a country we need to come to grips with. The Patients' Bill of Rights is an important piece of legislation. Not only does it make sense, but it also is the right thing to do.

The Ganske-Dingell bill accomplishes the critical goals of managed-care reform. First, one of the things that it does, it gives every American the right to choose their own doctor. That makes every sense in the world. That is the fact that each one of us should have, the right to choose our own doctor.

Secondly, the bill covers all Americans with employer-based health insurance, as well as other bills that, remarkably, exclude individuals such as firefighters, church employees, and teachers.

Thirdly, this bill ensures that we extend external reviews of medical decisions that are conducted by independent and qualified physicians. We should not be allowing insurance accountants and people who are going to be looking at the all-mighty dollar when deciding the decisions of health care of those people that are ensured.

Fourthly, it holds a plan accountable when the plan makes a bad decision that harms and kills someone. If the insurance and managed-care system decides not to provide access to care to someone, then we need to look at that seriously; and that is occurring throughout the country.

Finally, it guarantees that health care decisions are made based on the medical, not the financial, considerations. Managed-care companies must put health care first, and the Patients' Bill of Rights creates the incentives to make sure that that occurs.

Tonight, I am also joined here with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON). I am glad that he is here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) for yielding to me.

I wanted to come here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to speak on the Patients' Bill of Rights, which is currently being debated in Congress, and primarily to join my other friend from Texas here and talk specifically about some of the applicability of issues facing the Hispanic community in Texas and across the Nation.

But as I listened to the gentleman talk, I wanted to make another comment before I get into these particular remarks, because as the gentleman talked about the accessibility, about a person who might want to be treated for an illness that they know there is a cure for but to which they have no access, it reminds me of a friend of mine in Nederland, Texas, right by Beaumont in the heart of the 9th Congressional District, who is a school teacher, Regina Cowles; and Regina contracted breast cancer just a couple of years ago, and she found a treatment for that cancer in Houston. But because her insurance company made the decision

that this was not an appropriate treatment for her, they refused to make a payment.

And consequently, she did not have access to the treatment. We worked with that insurance company and ultimately got them to relent. They made the treatment available. And she went to Houston, and she got the treatment. Unfortunately, it was started much, much too late and she died.

Those are the kinds of things about which the gentleman is speaking; that is what we are concerned with, with people across the United States of America. And we hear these stories over and over again about someone other than a physician making a decision about treatment for a person's health care problem.

Soon after I came to the United States House of Representatives, I was asked by Dr. Joe DeLeon, a cardiologist in Port Arthur, Texas, for me to come and do one of my worker-for-a-day program, and I went to Dr. DeLeon's office; and I did a number of things with him during the course of the several hours that I spent there, but at one point in time, he asked me to go with one of his nurses and pre-certify the patients that were on his list, so that he could get permission from the insurance company to be able to see them.

I did that. I sat down and made 10 or 12 telephone calls and, interestingly enough, a large number of the people with whom I was speaking at those insurance companies were not health care-trained professionals. They were making decisions based on lists of information that were put there. More a part of it was the bottom line of that insurance company than was the health of the people who were wanting to see the doctors.

Mr. Speaker, that is what has to change, I say to my colleagues in the House of Representatives. We have to make sure that our effort to produce legislation is going to reach those persons whose lives can be affected by the work that we are doing and make sure that we make policy that will reach those people, because they choose to have and want to have and deserve to have the quality of life that they can have in the United States of America.

While I said that I came to talk about those issues affecting the Hispanic community particularly, as far as we have come as a Nation, obstacles to equality still exist; and we continue pushing forward to provide opportunities for all.

Currently in Texas, more than 1 million children lack health insurance, Hispanics representing a disproportionate number of that number of children. A restrictive enrollment to the interview and an interview process, coupled with a burdensome application process has helped to produce this disparity. A lack of access particularly with Spanish-speaking providers and services has caused difficulty in what has become a cumbersome and bureaucratic managed-care system.

Nationwide, Hispanics constitute 35.3 percent of the total uninsured population. This is a disparity which is rapidly reaching epidemic proportions. Much of the problem can be attributed to lack of funding for prevention and education initiatives, absence of culturally-competent information available for Hispanic communities to make educated health care decisions, and inadequate representation of Latinos in the health care professions.

This is a trend which absolutely must be curtailed. And as we begin to, again, debate the Patients' Bill of Rights, we must be mindful of the issues facing all of our communities and work toward a bill that will provide protections for every citizen. The time for political posturing has passed, and now it is time to deliver on a Patients' Bill of Rights.

I support the Dingell-Ganske Patients' Bill of Rights as a comprehensive approach that provides enforceable protections to all Americans and ensures health care decisions that are made by patients and doctors and not those insurance companies about which we were talking.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to come and join him, and I thank him for the good work that the gentleman is doing in helping us get the word out on this bill and make sure that we come up with provisions that will indeed make a difference in all Americans' lives.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I know that when the gentleman talked about that specific story, we all have stories; and we all have had calls and letters that we have received.

Mr. Speaker, I had a family that recently sent me a letter complaining about the fact that she had Lupus and had received some contact from the particular company, and it is unfortunate in terms of the difficulty that some of these people are having.

There is no doubt that when you are healthy and young, they are willing to have you onboard. As soon as you get sick and serious, then you begin to have some problems with those managed-care systems.

Mr. LAMPSON. If the gentleman will yield, those who are making those decisions need to be held accountable for those decisions, and that is what is going to change the complexion of health care in this country.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I also want to thank the gentleman. The gentleman mentioned the disparities that exist in the area of access to health care. We know that one of the biggest disparities that exists is the number of uninsured.

The gentleman talked about Hispanics. We have some data to show that in Texas it is over 33 percent; but throughout the country, we continue to have almost 25 percent, that lack access to healthcare insurance.

I want to share that with my colleagues a little bit, in terms of the discussion, a particular call that I had

from one of my constituents. I recently received a letter from this constituent, who is not only battling Lupus, but also battling her managed-care company.

□ 1945

Lupus is a chronic disease that causes the immune system to attack the body's own tissue. Patients often need access to several specialists because the disease can affect many different organ systems. When individuals need those several specialists, they find difficulty in dealing with the managed care system and difficulty in them responding.

I want to quote from a letter that a person received. It says, "People with lupus enrolled in managed care health plans should have immediate access to specialists and the specialty care they need even if those specialties are outside of the provider network. Because lupus can quickly become life-threatening, people with lupus should be able to seek emergency care when they reasonably believe that their health is in danger. They should not have to go through the lengthy complicated appeals process for receiving special care."

Mr. Speaker, this story speaks well to the importance of a strong patient bill of rights. It is important to ensure that those who have private health coverage also have meaningful health care coverage that they can depend on when they are in need. I am a strong supporter of this, and I think it is important for us to continue to be supportive of this effort that when an individual is ill they have to be able to have access to those specialists, especially in specific cases such as lupus and many others. Unfortunately, people that find themselves in this bind also are having to battle the managed care systems throughout our country.

I also want to mention that it is unfortunate that both administratively and legislatively recently we decided to look at the tax cut as the number one priority before we begin to look at the issues that confront us. It was unfortunate that we went forward on this tax cut without looking at the resources that were going to be needed, not only in all aspects of health care but all the other issues that confront us. It leaves too many Americans with diminished hopes in the area of health care. We are following the wrong path. We should first meet our needs and our priorities, which must include access to health care, before helping those individuals on the tax cuts.

We face two great health care obstacles before us. First, too many Americans do not have the basic health care coverage that is needed. Secondly, even those who do often find themselves subject to a bureaucracy that they can neither understand nor navigate, a bureaucracy that is not responsive, a bureaucracy that needs to be pushed into doing the right thing. I am not referring to government, I am referring to

the private sector and the managed care systems. We can no longer put off addressing these two great health care issues, the issue of access and managed care reform.

The problem of access to care is not a small problem. More than 42 million persons, and the number is growing in this United States, lack access to good health care insurance. The burden falls disproportionately on a lot of the poor and minorities throughout this country. So many places of employment do not provide coverage. And let me add that those working in a small company, if it is not a major corporation, probably do not have access to insurance. Those not working for government, whether it be local government or Federal Government, probably do not have access to health insurance. So people find themselves in a real serious problem. Individuals not over 65 do not have Medicare; individuals who are not indigent, they do not have Medicaid. So here we have working Americans finding themselves in a real bind.

In America, the rural populations face special challenges to access care. For example, nearly one-fourth, or 25 percent, of the uninsured in the United States are Hispanic, as indicated earlier. That is twice the proportion based on population. So we can see the disproportionate numbers. In addition, African Americans also lack insurance, 25 percent of them, when they only represent half of that amount of the population. So we can see the disparity in these communities. The rest are people that are poor and that do not have access to insurance but who are out there working trying to make ends meet.

Roughly 20 percent of the uninsured live in rural areas. I have the distinction of having both not only an urban area in San Antonio but also 13 other counties of rural Texas, and I find myself that a lot of the rural counties have a great amount of difficulty with managed care systems, partly because of the reimbursement rates, partly because of the problem that a lot of the managed care systems choose not to go into rural America, and also because of the difficulties in terms of providing access to the ones that are really in need.

According to recent studies by the Kaiser Family Foundation, the rural populations tend to be older, they tend to be poorer and they tend to be less healthy compared to the people living in urban areas. So here we find ourselves with a very vulnerable population and a real need for us to reach out. When we look at the statistics of the uninsured, our children, the numbers are staggering. Nearly 11 million children under 19 do not have access to insurance. We have tried some efforts in that area, but a lot more needs to occur and we hopefully will continue to move forward in those directions.

In places like my hometown of San Antonio I am ashamed to say one-third, or 33 percent, of our children do not have coverage for health insurance.

The burden falls not only on the children and not only on the families but also on the local governments. The reason why that is, for example, in the State of Texas we hold each county obligated up to 10 percent of their budgets to make sure they provide for the health care of their constituency. Yet those rural counties in south Texas, along the border, are expending up to 30 percent of their budgets for the poor. The rich counties have less poor and so do not have to expend as much, but a poor county, where individuals are paying property taxes, and in some cases in Texas for the hospital districts they are having to pay more to take care of these individuals, because the children's access to care is at the most expensive point, the emergency room.

We need to make every effort to make sure that we take care of those kids before the emergency room; that we take care of those people before the emergency room. The cost rises as local governments are forced to raise taxes. So it is important for us to look at health care as a major issue that confronts this country and an issue that we have been unwilling to deal with not only as elected officials but as a community as a whole. Everyone pays and everyone pays too much because we do not offer the proper care up front.

We need to look at the preventive care that is so very critical and very important and that can help prevent a lot of the diseases. The beauty of it now is that we can tell when youngsters are prone to have diabetes, type 2 diabetes, but what do we do with that information? Unless we do something to help prevent that diabetes as that youngster grows up, then we are defeating ourselves.

My colleagues will also hear me speak time and time again on the need for improving access for the uninsured, especially with regard to the health status of the most underserved population, the poor, the rural population, the children, and minority of this country. The current debate on patients' rights illustrates the access to service that does not necessarily guarantee quality of service.

We tend to associate barriers to care only with the uninsured, but even the insured in this country have a barrier to service. Those who have health insurance also, as my colleagues well know, face those barriers, and we need to make sure that those people at least have access. After all, they have been paying for that insurance, and when they get sick, it should be there for them.

Let me be clear. Managed care companies provide a valuable service for millions of Americans. Health care must be affordable and it must be available. HMOs do work hard to reach those goals, but there are excesses. There are situations where individuals lose out and there are situations where HMOs have not been responsive. For many, health care coverage has not been there when it is needed.

I recall a story that was told of LBJ, when he looked at establishing Medicare and Medicaid in this country back in the 1960s, and the story is that when he was having difficulty with the insurance companies who continued to bring obstacles on Medicare and Medicaid, he brought them into a room and he basically told them, and it is a very similar situation that we find ourselves in now, where he said, look, we all know that you are willing to take care of individuals when they are young and healthy, but as soon as they get old and sick, you are unwilling to expend what needs to be expended.

As the story goes, LBJ got those people there into that room that were part of the insurance companies of this country and he told them, look, I am willing to help you by taking and being able to support and establish a Medicare and taking care of the senior citizens. After all, the statistics and the data showed that a lot of the companies were basically dumping our seniors after they got sick, very similar to what we find now in a lot of areas.

So LBJ was able to convince them to support him on establishing Medicare for our seniors because, after all, those are the ones that are the most ill, those are the ones where the private sector is less likely to make a profit from, and they knew that they needed some help in that area.

For the same reason, for the indigent, who did not have the resources to buy the insurance, he asked them to allow him the opportunity to establish Medicaid for the indigent so that these people that do not have those resources to buy insurance that they can be able to have access.

So now we find a dilemma that in this country we somewhat take care of our seniors with Medicare and somewhat take care of our indigent with Medicaid, but in middle America we find people who are working hard, who are trying to make ends meet, in a bind, and yet not having access to good quality care. In fact, we have the largest number of uninsured in this country, over 42 million and growing.

So many of us have experienced the frustration of having also changed doctors because they are no longer a part of our plan. The patient bill of rights addresses this issue, where individuals should have the right to see the doctor of their choice. It does not make any sense for them to force an individual to see someone that they do not want to see, especially if they have their own doctor.

It also is troubling not being referred to specialists when a doctor says a person needs to see a specialist. That opportunity needs to be there and that opportunity is not there now with the private sector, some HMOs, who are giving individuals a rough time and giving those people who do pay their monthly premiums and should be able to have access to good quality care and to the specialists that they need. Such is the case with my constituent with

lupus who had difficulty getting access to good care.

We continue to hear these stories throughout the country. The passage of a Patient's Bill of Rights is important for all Americans and for members of the various communities that make up this Nation. As chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, on the Task Force on Health Care, I would also like to highlight briefly how a Patient's Bill of Rights would help the Hispanic community in particular.

The needs of managed care reform is especially important for Hispanics. Fully two-thirds of privately insured Hispanics are enrolled in managed care while only about one-half of privately insured whites are in managed care. This is based on a study done by a medical expenditures panel survey. In addition, the health care system is complicated enough, but for Hispanics and populations with limited English proficiency, the task of dealing with managed care is even more difficult. We need access to good culturally competent, linguistically sensitive providers that serve our communities.

I want to share an example when we talk about culturally competent. This was a story that I continue to tell because it is a true story, a devastating story, of a woman who was told that she was positive for AIDS.

□ 2000

In Spanish when you say positive, just like in English, it is "positivo." If you do not explain what that means, the lady when she was told she was positive, she felt everything was great, not realizing that she was positive for AIDS, and she had a child that contracted AIDS. So the issue of cultural competency and linguistic understanding is very important.

Hispanics, because they are more likely to be in managed care, are also more likely to have limited providers' options and limited treatment options. By having the right to choose doctors, patients can seek a doctor who speaks the same language. Managed care may be less likely to provide treatment and diagnosis that most affect these populations.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for his leadership on the question of health care, both as a Member of Congress as well as a member of the State legislature in Texas. I think this is an important enough topic to give a chronological history.

As I was listening to this debate in my office, I thought it was important to explain that people should not be frightened about this compromise. I am excited by the Senate bill and the compromise in the bill in the House, the Ganske-Dingell bill. I see no reason why this bill cannot pass from the House into the Senate and receive the signature of President Bush.

As the gentleman from Texas knows, Texas passed a similar initiative; and to my knowledge, we have not suffered in the loss of good health care. I am sure that we can work to even improve the concept of reasonable balance between patients and physicians. That is all we are talking about, is giving the American people the right to be able to make decisions about their health care along with their physicians, simply plain and straight to the point.

I am reminded of this debate, and I have been engaged in this debate it seems to be three sessions. I remember when we had a number of hearings about tragic situations which have occurred. I would like to bring back one in particular, and I think this young man if I recall, I do not want to add to the story, but I believe he was an amputee, at least two legs, I am not sure, I think he lost two hands as well. He was a youngster under the age of 12. He was an example of a youngster who had been picnicking with his relatives and had fallen and had gotten onto some dirty nails. His family was rushing him to an emergency room, but because of their insurance, their insurance was not accepted at that particular emergency room. Therefore, they had to travel miles away. It was a rural community. Just that distance caused the young man to be put in dire condition and therefore became an amputee on that basis because he could not be treated by the immediate emergency room. That is what the Patient Bill of Rights is attempting to do, to be able to ensure that the Hispanic woman who spoke Spanish, who understood everything is okay from the word "positive" versus that you are positive with HIV, that kind of lack of sensitivity would be no more.

That the idea of being turned away from an emergency room simply because you are in the wrong location simply has to stop. This is a powerful country, and although health care is not in the constitution, it certainly should be a right and privilege of Americans.

This particular bill as I understand it allows for the extra protection, I do not call it the right for a lawsuit, the extra protection to be able to, if you will, challenge and hold responsible any culprit, any particular entity that divides health care between patient and physician.

If the HMO tells the loved one while the patient is needing care I am sorry they cannot get it because your insurance does not cover or you have not paid enough, or we do not want you to have that because the doctor says you should have it, it is extra and something tragic happens, I believe that the American public deserves the right to hold that entity accountable. That is all we are asking for, is to ensure that those privileges are had and the Patient Bill of Rights reestablishes the privileges of the patient and reestablishes the right for medication and dialysis, reestablishes the right treat-

ment for diabetes as opposed to being denied that right; and so many of my constituents have had that experience.

Mr. Speaker, elderly are living longer and the HMO is saying, I am sorry, they are at that limit, we are not going to approve it.

In closing, I had that experience with my father. Of course we do not come to the floor of the House to generate personal stories of our personal dilemmas or personal frustrations, but it is always good for people to know that we walk in their shoes. There is no special treatment and should be no special treatment for Members of Congress, and we do not want any special treatment. I want every American who has health insurance to feel the confidence that you can go in and assure that that physician is going to be the one between yourself and if it is a loved one, deciding the best health care, having the ability of the physician to be able to expand on health care or procedures, not frivolous procedures, we do not want that. We have been in a process of efficiency and management. I believe in that. I believe in bringing down the costs.

But, Mr. Speaker, I also believe that this bill is long overdue, that physicians can sit down and say I think he or she can try this treatment or I think you need this surgery and I have researched it and they need to have it.

Mr. Speaker, to see a patient on the phone lines trying to argue with the insurance companies is a frustrating process to watch; and I encountered that through the long illness of my father, talking in the hospital, in a phone booth, trying to talk to the insurance company to provide a certain coverage of someone who had paid insurance and was covered by insurance, and trying to make the argument that this is a kind of treatment that was needed or a transport that was needed because insurance companies pay for transportation from one hospital to the next.

I do not think that Americans should be subjected to that, and particularly those who adequately provide coverage for them or their loved ones. This is an important effort that we are engaging in. I hope this bill that is being debated in the Senate will quickly come to the House and we will find a way in our consciences and also in our representation of the American people to finally give them a Patient's Bill of Rights which balances patients, physicians, loved ones, and insurance companies.

I say to the industry of insurers that sometimes it looks frightening when you see something on the horizon, but it is interesting enough that a number of States, including the State of Texas, has now for at least 4 years had the kind of Patient Bill of Rights that we are trying to give to the American people.

I do want to refute the point that insurance costs are going up. We have already documented that corporations can find a way that they do not pass

those fees or suggested costs on to the insured, on to the employees. It can be done. It did not happen in Texas as we understand it; and, therefore, I do not think it will happen on a national level.

I thank the distinguished Member for having this time to talk about this important issue. I hope that our colleagues will move this bill quickly because I think it is an important step for America in improving the health care delivery system that is so much needed.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her participation. I know the gentlewoman mentioned specifically about the fact that there are people making decisions, and as we well know, sometimes it is the accountant making a decision whether the patient should have a specialist or not. The ones making the decision should be the physicians. They are the ones that know best. They should be deciding whether a patient should have access to a specialist or not, and it should not be based upon economics. As the gentlewoman knows, this bill will make sure that occurs.

As the gentlewoman stated, we want to see the doctors of our choice. It is a basic right that a patient should see a doctor that they want to see and that just makes all of the sense in the world. We want to make sure the patient feels comfortable. The gentlewoman mentioned the importance in terms of making sure that the language barriers and the competency is there. Nothing is worse than a patient being sent to someone that they do not feel comfortable with, that they do not feel secure with. That the patient feels maybe they are not making the right decisions. Maybe a patient has someone that they have been seeing all this time that they want to continue to see.

I have always had my own doctor, and I have continued to see him despite the fact that my insurance does not cover those visits, but I continue to see him because I want to see him.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, that is a vital point. That is the continuum of care. Over the last 5-10 years, we have seen the patient moved around like a shopping cart being moved around at the grocery store. One time you are in one aisle looking at cereal boxes. Another time canned meats, another time fruit juices, meaning that the patient cannot have that physician that they have a trust in that they have had for 10 or 15 years. We used to keep our physicians for a period of time. When the insurance came in and said I am sorry, you have to move on to Doctor So-and-so because your long-standing doctor is not on the list. Continuum of care is a vital part of health care in America.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman has hit the nail right on the head. That is one issue that all Americans agree we need to push for. The Patient Bill of Rights allows us to have the doctor of our choice.

When we look at that and when we look at lawsuits, we have not seen that many lawsuits, but I will attest that if an accountant makes a decision whether you should see a specialist or not and that person dies, and that decision was made not for a medical reason but in terms of financing, then they have every right to be sued for malpractice. It is unfortunate that that is occurring in this country. We need to put a stop to that. I thank the gentlewoman for being here with us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to stress a little more in terms of the language barriers that exist, both to services and to health care that we encounter. The experiences that a lot of people have, if they do not speak the language, it becomes very difficult. We need to continue to move forward on that.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I am joined by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL). I know the gentleman has been active on health care and has serious concerns about access to health care, and I thank the gentleman for joining me tonight.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. It is nice to be here with the gentleman this evening. Let me first say that the leadership of the Hispanic Caucus on the health care issues and on the Patient's Bill of Rights has been very impressive. I have a district in New Mexico that is 38 percent Hispanic, close to 20 percent Native American, and the leadership that the Hispanic Caucus has shown in terms of educating us on these issues has been very, very helpful to me.

The gentleman mentioned an issue that I wanted to say something about, until I go on to continue with the Patient Bill of Rights, and that issue is this issue of why we are giving patients the right to sue an HMO.

Mr. Speaker, we have two States which have passed laws very similar to the bills we are considering now. California and Texas have passed Patient Bill of Rights laws. To listen to the other side argue and to listen to the HMO community, the managed care community argue, one would think that we were going to have runaway lawsuits. You would think that juries are going to go crazy and award massive awards. In fact, those two laws which have been in place now a number of months, one of them in Texas, went through and was put in. President Bush did not sign it, but he could have prevented it and he allowed it to become law. I believe only a half dozen people have even filed a claim under that law.

□ 2015

And so the one thing that we have got to get the word out on is that this is not a situation that is going to jeopardize these companies. This is not a situation that is going to end up in runaway jury verdicts. This is a situation where we just give a patient an opportunity to have their day in court is

really what we are talking about, if they are seriously injured, if someone is killed as a result of a medical decision, that they have that kind of opportunity. That is a very important point.

I think the same thing is true, as the gentleman knows in California. Only about a handful of individuals have filed. It has not been a situation that has fostered lawsuits. The important thing here is to protect the civil justice system.

A couple of words on the Patients' Bill of Rights. I believe that this is a very, very good bill because it protects patients and all of their various options. There is nothing more frustrating as a patient to have care denied and not understand why. There is nothing more frustrating as a patient to have an expert be turned down to look at your particular case. What we are talking about here is very simple, common-sense rules that make the HMOs produce quality care.

I will never forget as State attorney general when I heard this whole idea of managed care coming in, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) knows, they sold it to us that it was going to be cost effective, which they have cut a lot of costs, there is no doubt about that; but they said the quality of care is going to go up. In fact, that has not happened. The quality of care has gone down, people have been denied care, patients find themselves dealing with these large bureaucracies, and they do not have any idea how to get through them. That is a big, big problem.

Let me just sum up by saying, the Hispanic Caucus has been a real leader on this issue. They have taught me a lot, the gentleman and the other members. It is a real pleasure to carry on this colloquy today with the gentleman about these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that is important to and affects many people throughout the country, particularly many of my constituents who live in the 3rd Congressional District of New Mexico. As our colleagues in the Senate begin to take up the very important issue of a Patients Bill of Rights, it is important that we highlight the various and unique obstacles that Hispanics in the United States face when it comes to managed care.

Many Hispanics who belong to managed care programs often face obstacles that others do not. One obstacle is language barriers. At times, language barriers adversely affect not only their access to health care, but that of their children, as well. A recent report by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality showed that the inability of many Hispanic children to access care is a result of their parents' inability to speak English well enough to interact fully with the health care system. Furthermore, pamphlets and written information are sometimes available only in English, which presents another set of challenges for many Hispanics in the United States.

Moreover, the difficulty of navigating through the bureaucratic managed care system is often complex and burdensome. This can

often present a challenge to anybody, but can be compounded by unfamiliarity with the managed care system and difficulty with the English language.

In addition to these specific problems faced directly by some Hispanics accessing and obtaining managed care, there is also a general lack of data that outlines the specific Hispanic needs pertaining to managed care programs.

While these issues I just mentioned are faced by Hispanics on an individual basis, there is another more systemic problem, that being the lack of Hispanic representation at the administrative level. It is important that more Hispanics are able to participate in the decision-making processes in managed care. There are many reasons why this is important, one of which is that individual's from similar backgrounds can better related to the challenges faced at the individual level.

As this Congress takes up a Patient's Bill of Rights and help guarantee the safety and care of patients, it is important that we not forget the unique challenges that Hispanics face when dealing with managed care. The issues that have been discussed tonight must be addressed in order to insure that Hispanics are able to receive the care they need and deserve.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for his service. I know he has been working real hard in this area, too. He mentioned the lawsuits. He is right and correct in the fact that we have not seen those lawsuits in Texas. It just gives that right. They know that the decision should be made by the medical profession and not by the accountants. In addition, he also represents a State that has a lot of rural community, a lot of Hispanics also that are uninsured. I know he has worked hard in representing them. I want to thank him for what he has done in that area. And also the fact that rural America, such as rural New Mexico and Texas, find themselves without access to health care. A lot of the managed-care systems are not operating in rural America. We have a great deal of difficulty in getting access to managed care in those areas. It has created a lot of problems for us. I want to thank the gentleman personally for what he has done on behalf of New Mexico and everyone in New Mexico including the Hispanics there.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. The rural part of this, as the gentleman knows, is a huge issue. Rural America does not have the opportunity to take the benefits that managed care provides, and we are especially seeing that in my district and in rural New Mexico in regard to Hispanics. I thank the gentleman once again for his leadership. I see we have another of our distinguished colleagues here that I know he is going to talk about, a real champion of health care issues for Hispanics.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for joining us tonight. I thank him for coming out. I know it is kind of late.

We are also joined tonight by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ). I want to thank her for com-

ing out here tonight. I know it is kind of late. She was also working on an issue today on the House floor. I thank her for coming back and joining me.

Ms. SANCHEZ. I thank my colleague from Texas very much. This is such an important issue. I want to take the opportunity to thank him as a Hispanic sitting on the Hispanic Caucus, which is the nonpartisan official working group of this House of Representatives that talks to the issues that in particular affect Hispanics. Of course the gentleman and I both know that health and health care is one of the largest problem areas for our population for a lot of reasons, lack of knowledge in particular. And so when we look at something like a Patients' Bill of Rights, when we look at the effect that policy can have on giving right information, giving all the information, explaining better the information to a potential patient becomes very important for Hispanics in particular. Or just the convenience factor. Most of us, we run around and we think it would be difficult to schedule different appointments with different doctors. For someone in the working class, it is very difficult to take time off from work in order to go and see their doctor, and so to make multiple visits becomes a very difficult thing.

I just want to take the opportunity to thank the gentleman for the type of work he has been doing, heading up the health care task force within the Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I thank the gentlewoman for joining me tonight. She has worked hard in the caucus on various task forces. I know she is interested in health also, and I know she is very interested in the Patients' Bill of Rights. We have talked tonight about the importance of seeing the doctor of our choice, the importance of making sure that physicians make the decisions and not accountants, the importance of making sure that we hold the managed-care system accountable when that person needs a specialist and the physician says that they need a specialist, then that person should be allotted that specialist.

We have a variety of cases that have been brought, I know, to her office. The gentlewoman has had letters from people who have had difficulty with managed-care systems. I shared with the public a particular person who had had lupus, a disease that required a variety of specialists and had not only had to fight with her illness but also had to fight with our managed-care system.

Ms. SANCHEZ. And in particular with respect to diseases, it is really troublesome when we see that the Hispanic population in particular in the United States is having such a problem. They are one of the largest, fastest-growing segments of the population with respect to HIV. Not enough testing gets done there. They have the highest, probably three or four times out of the general population, ability or propensity to get diabetes.

We not only see that they need to see doctors but why it becomes so important to see the doctor of your choice. In some cases, there can be language barriers, not getting exactly the right communication going between doctor and patient. Think about how we feel. Once we find a doctor that we are comfortable with, it is almost like we do not want our insurance ever to change because we want to be able to have always the same doctor. You feel comfortable going to that doctor. Imagine how somebody feels who may not completely and totally understand the English language as well as a natural-born citizen here. I think of my own parents. My mother has a master's degree in Spanish and English. She is a teacher. Yet she always feels more comfortable hearing, especially difficult things, complicated things, complex things, in her native language of Spanish than she does in English.

Think about if you have ever been to the doctor, and they come out to tell you something, most of the time these doctors do not even know how to tell you in layman's terms what the heck is wrong with you and they are talking English. Imagine if you have the barrier of a language, it becomes even more important for people to have choice of doctor, to have portability if they go to a different job, of taking that insurance. And also a lot has been said about, oh, my God, this Patients' Bill of Rights is just about lawyers who make lots of money being able to sue HMOs.

That is not the case. First of all, if you are working class or lower income, even if you are middle class, actually, and you have a problem and you go to do these types of suits, you go to do a type of suit like this, it is a very long and expensive process. And so these contingent fees, if this goes nowhere, those lawyers, they lose all the expense money and all their time and effort. They do not get paid one dime on that. I think those who saw "Erin Brockovich," for example, understood that comment, that these people really only take a case if they think that there is something there most of the time. And so for someone, especially in the Hispanic population, a majority of the people who are Hispanics, we fall in that category. We do not have a lawyer on retainer. How do we know what to do?

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. The gentlewoman is right. I think one of the realities is that we need to make sure that everyone has the right to have access to health care. In so doing, she talks about the importance of those barriers and cultural competencies. If you are a woman, you might want to see a woman, depending on the type of illness. There is no doubt that in terms of feeling more comfortable, sometimes even a Hispanic might not make you feel comfortable. And so it is important that you see the doctor of your choice. Once again, she mentioned the issue of lawsuits. I think it is important that the judiciary is always the

last resort. If you are doing the right thing, you should not be afraid of that. But when you do have people that are not physicians making the decisions whether you should see a specialist or not, then you need to be liable. I think it is important that the decision is based on money.

What we found in Texas that has the same rights as we want to establish here, we have not seen the lawsuits. We have not seen the abuse. Where we have seen the abuse is where they feel they can do and undo as they please because of the fact that you cannot do anything about it. It reminds me of that story, of that person who finds themselves having to fight both the disease and the system.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for joining me here tonight. We have a few more that have come over, a young lady that has also talked about coming and talking, so we will continue to do that. I do not know if she wanted to make any other comments.

Ms. SANCHEZ. That is fine. I know you have a couple of more over here to talk about their feelings and what people in their districts are feeling with respect to the Patients' Bill of Rights. We really need to do something about righting this situation. People should have choices. They should be comfortable that they have choices, and they should feel that they have been dealt a fair hand in dealing with the insurance coverage that they have. I thank the gentleman for doing this Special Order.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) for joining us.

We are pleased to be joined by several other Members. I want to ask them to go to the mikes as they get comfortable, and then later on we will be dialoguing as they come in. I want to ask both of them to join us as we bring closure to the comments of tonight. I thank them for coming out here tonight as we talk about the Patients' Bill of Rights and the impact and the importance of having access to the doctors of our choice, making sure that if the physician says that we need a specialist, that we do have a specialist. I thank the gentleman for being here.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I thank the gentleman for sharing these few moments with me. I will be very short. I was watching the gentleman on C-Span. I thought of one of my constituents that I wanted to come over and share with him. Tonight in Hillsboro, Ohio, in Highland County, Ohio, there is a constituent of mine who is 31 years old. Her name is Patsy Haines, she is a wife and a mother, and she has chronic leukemia. This Saturday we are going to have an auction. We are going to auction off items that neighbors and friends have contributed to get money to try to help Patsy Haines and her family afford the medical care she needs.

I would like to explain something else briefly. Patsy Haines worked for a

particular company that had a self-insured policy, insurance plan. She worked there for 5 years, until she became too ill to work. Her husband has worked at that company for 7 years. Patsy Haines has a brother who provides a perfect match for a bone marrow transplant. Her doctor says if Patsy Haines receives this transplant, the chances are she will be cured and live a long life and rear her child and be a wife to her husband.

This is the problem: the insurance company refuses to pay for the transplant, saying that it is experimental. I went to the James Cancer Hospital in Columbus, Ohio, where some of the world's leading cancer experts work. I talked to the transplant team there. I talked to a young, very inspirational physician, degrees from Stanford and Harvard and a leading expert in bone marrow transplant.

□ 2030

He confirmed that this is exactly what Patsy Haines needs. He said it is the standard treatment.

I went to the Ohio Department of Insurance and I shared Patsy Haines' story with them and they were sympathetic but they said we really have no jurisdiction over this situation.

So we find ourselves in the United States of America, in the year 2001, where a young woman, a wife, a mother, is facing a situation where she may lose her life. It is shameful. All of us in this Chamber should be ashamed that we have not passed a Patients' Bill of Rights long ago. It is beyond belief almost that we would actually stand in these Chambers and debate whether or not an American citizen should have the right to go into a court of law to have their rights defended when they are denied necessary and needed medical care.

I thank the gentleman for this special order. The American people need to know what is going on. If they do know, I believe we will be forced to do the right thing even if we choose not to. So I thank the gentleman for this special order and for this time that has been given to me, and I hope that we can move together in the days and the weeks to come to accomplish this good thing for the American people.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman very much for sharing that story. As we see, each Congressman that has come has shared a story from their constituents; and I want to thank them for that.

As we start bringing closure, I want to make sure I recognize my fellow Congresswoman, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), who is joining us tonight.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I came in at the tail end of this; and I certainly want to add my two cents. I have been in the labor market, so to speak, over 50 years. It may seem kind of crazy, but I have been. In those years, I have seen the different types of coverage that employees have had be-

cause during my work period I can remember when an employee would have an illness or a need to have surgery. There was never any question about the services to be rendered to that individual by the coverage the company afforded them. There never was a question about whether or not it was legitimate or not. It was assumed that if the employee was determined to have a need, that need would be filled by the provider.

Well, things have changed. And through the years, we see that the companies have put in place deterrents for people to get the type of care that they are entitled to, because the insurance company provides it for them and they determine that they are the ones who are going to determine whether or not it is going to be treatable.

Well, that affects us all. I have had numerous phone calls from constituents just recently, a gentleman, a business owner no less, who has been in business many years, diabetic, had a foot infection. He was waiting for the provider to tell him whether or not he could get services in a hospital to take care of an infection. That is a very serious thing for a diabetic to have a toe infection. So I asked him to go to the top and make his wishes known. He was a businessman that should have been able to reach somebody besides an accountant telling him, well, wait until the decision is made.

We have many people whose lives hang by a thread and the more that they are made to wait the chances for their survival diminish. I think it is important for the people to understand that we want to have the ability to pass such legislation so they should also be aware that as we go through this session that we would like to have their input so that we can then be more cognizant of what we need to do.

We already have all kinds of information. However, it is not happening; and I think it is time that we move forward and get through Congress this year an effective bill of rights that allows any individual, legitimately needing a service, to be able to obtain it.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for her comments. The Ganske-Dingell piece of legislation allows this opportunity. By the way, this particular bill has been passed by the House and we will have an opportunity to pass it again and hopefully pass it through both Houses and be able to make it through.

Once again, I want to thank all the Members that have come out today to provide their testimony of the importance of the Patients' Bill of Rights and the importance of passing this to be able to see the doctor of one's choice.

WE ARE ALL FOR A PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3,

2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to the comments of the previous speakers. This evening, I want to really focus the majority of my comments on differences between the East and the West in the United States, differences between the East and the West in the State of Colorado and really talk a little about natural resources and water and so on, but I cannot help but have listened to the comments, the preceding comments.

I would point out that I think, for example, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) who cites an example of a constituent of his who needs a bone marrow transplant, I think those stories are very appropriate. I think it helps us focus in on the debate. What I question and what I intend to challenge, and my colleagues understand this, what I intend to challenge are some of the stories that I am beginning to hear.

This evening I heard from one of the preceding speakers that a young man apparently fell on a nail, was taken to an emergency room. The emergency room refused to treat him even though he apparently was, quote, in dire straits, because he did not have the right insurance and that as a result of that young man being refused in an emergency room because he did not have the right insurance, he was transported to another hospital and as a result of the transportation resulted in the amputation of his leg.

If this is true, it is a pretty remarkable story, very sad story. What I think tends to happen, what I think tends to happen when we get in a very emotional debate, is that some of these stories get exaggerated. Now I have often heard people say, well, someone is refused because they did not have insurance, they were dying, they were hauled to the emergency room from a car accident and the emergency room doctor said, sorry, you do not have insurance and we are not going to treat you. That is not true.

If it is, let me know about the particular case, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, who by the way is from Texas, I hope he provides me with the details and the names of those people because I would like to investigate the case. If we have emergency rooms in this country who truly reject someone who necessarily needs emergency treatment, number one, it is against a Federal law if they accept any Federal funds at all, and there are very few hospitals in the country that do not accept Federal funds, so if they are doing that they are violating the Federal law.

Number two, my bet is that once we hear the other side of the story, that many of the stories we are about to hear as this Patients' Bill of Rights begins to pick up momentum, let me put it this way: I think we, on this floor, have an obligation to be accurate in our statements, especially when we are

dealing with human life and especially when we are dealing with human suffering and especially when we are attacking, for example, some hospital who theoretically rejected a young man who was in, quote, dire straits and as a result the young man got his leg amputated. That is pretty serious allegations.

Maybe it is true. As I said, I kind of question it, but I would like to look into it.

Furthermore, I know that Patients' Bill of Rights sounds good. I would just urge my colleagues, remember that saying, the devil is in the fine print. You stand up, you go out on any street in America and say, hey, do you agree with a Patients' Bill of Rights? And they are going to say well, sure what is wrong with that. Sounds good.

It does sound good, but before you sign, Mr. Speaker, the American people to this contract you better take a look at what the fine details say. I can say to my colleagues, it is a bunch of hogwash for them to believe for one moment that this Patients' Bill of Rights is not going to result in lots of lawsuits. America is a country of litigation.

America is a country of intense legal wrangling. Give the trial lawyers an opportunity to prosecute cases, they are going to go after it like a kid goes after cookies. Let us be up front. Now I am not saying that there are not cases where there should not be lawsuits but let us be up front when we talk about this. Do not pretend more lawsuits are not going to result. Of course more lawsuits are going to result. Let us debate whether they are justified or not justified. At least let us be open on the front end and say this Patients' Bill of Rights will result in trial lawyers filing lots of lawsuits in this country.

If these lawsuits are not justified, it is the consumer who will pay for them. Let us take a look, as we have, and I want patients to have rights, all of us do, but do not pull the wool over their eyes by saying here is a bill of rights that in the end costs them more money and as a result more money to get insurance and as a result less people get insurance because insurances become more costly because my colleagues, on this House floor, decided they are going to ride in on their white horse and save the American patient from, as described earlier, gross abuse. There are unique cases of abuse and those should be addressed, but be very careful about what you are going to sign on to. Do not let the emotional thrill or the emotional warmth or the cuddliness of the word of a bill entice you into believing that this is the answer for our medical crisis in this country.

There are a lot of good doctors in this country. We happen to have a pretty darn good medical delivery system in this country. Sure, we need improvement. Sure, we would like to figure out how to get more people insurance. Sure, we would like to figure out the

prescription costs in this country. But do not take that little bit of bad and throw out all the good. Do not, in an attempt to fix the bad, end up making its spread worse and actually doing damage to the good things that our medical health delivery system in this country does for us.

WHEN THE WEST MEETS THE EAST

Mr. MCINNIS. Let me move on from there. I had an interesting talk in Massachusetts not too long ago. Of course, as my colleagues know, my district is the Rocky Mountains of the State of Colorado. It is the highest district in the Nation elevation-wise. It is a district with great beauty, huge mountains. We have 54 mountains over 14,000 feet, by far more than any other district in the country. It is a district that many, many people visit, Aspen, Telluride, Beaver Creek, Steamboat Springs, Durango, Glenwood Springs down in the San Luis Valley, Rocky Mountain National Park, Great Sand Dunes, Colorado National Monument, the Black Canyon National Park. Most of my colleagues have all been probably at one point or another been into my district for a vacation.

Going back to my point, I was in Massachusetts. I was talking to a wonderful couple named Tony and Cathy Frasso and their son David. We were talking about public land. We were talking about some of the differences between the State of Massachusetts and the lands in Massachusetts versus the lands in the West. There is a dramatic difference between the lands and the way the lands are governed, for example, between the way decisions are made on lands in the East and lands in the West. That is really where I want to start my comments and focus my comments on natural resources this evening.

Let us take a look at just what I mean by that. Obviously, we have here a map of the United States. We will see in this map that the color over here represents government lands. So on this map, what this map depicts, is wherever color is seen on the map that says that that is owned by the government, that land is owned by the government. If we will notice, my district, by the way, is right here in the State of Colorado, right along this border. That district geographically, that land mass right there, is larger than the entire State of Florida. We will notice how interesting it is that in our country primarily in the East, in other words from my eastern border on the third district in Colorado to the Atlantic Ocean, and from Canada to Mexico, there is very little government land in these areas. Look at some of these States. They have little dots of public lands. Some of these States hardly have any government lands at all and yet when we take a look at this eastern border and come West to the Pacific Ocean or again go from Canada down to Mexico, we see massive amounts of government land.

□ 2045

Well, there are a couple of questions about that. Number one, from a historical point of view, why the difference? Why does the government own big chunks of land in the West and, relatively speaking, very little land in the East? What kind of impact does it have on decision making? And what is it like to live when you are completely surrounded?

You see in these colored areas, there are communities, millions of people live out on these lands, or they are surrounded by these government lands. The public "public lands" is not an often spoken word out in some of these States. In my district, it is spoken about all the time.

Let us talk and give an answer to the first question I asked, what is the historical basis for this massive amount of government land in the West, and yet very little government land in the East? It is really pretty simple, and it goes back to the frontier days of our country.

When our country was being settled, we were making acquisitions of land. It was our dream in this country to expand our boundaries, to go out and go west. Remember, going west was just a little ways west of Washington, D.C. back then. But the dream was to go out into the new frontier and claim new land for this new country that we had, to make our country great, by growing it in size.

But in order to do that back in those days, you did not just get a deed. For example, when we purchased Louisiana, made the Louisiana Purchase, simply having a deed to the property did not mean a whole lot. In fact, in those days, possession, as the old saying goes, possession is nine-tenths of the law. You really needed to be on the property, in possession of the property, with a six-shooter on your side. That is a lot, the law of how the land in the West was settled.

So, what happened, the government had to figure out, they had to occupy this land. Your elected leaders in Washington, D.C. had to figure out how do we get people to go west? How do we get people to possess this land? How do we get people to till the land and to put the land to good use so that we continue to build this fine country of ours?

The answer came up that most people will leave the comfort of their home, or at least a good number of people will leave the comfort of their home, if you promise them what every American dreams of, owning their own piece of land, having a piece of property that is in their name.

So the government decided the way to bring the people off the East Coast here and bring them west was to promise them land. They called that the Homestead Act, I think about 1862. And the government said to the American people, go out into this frontier, find a piece of property, put your stakes in the ground, and, if you farm it for a pe-

riod of time, generally 3 to 5 years, we will let you take title to maybe 160 acres or 320 acres.

You see, back then, in Kansas, for example, or up there in Nebraska, or over in Iowa or Mississippi or Missouri or some of those areas, 160 acres was adequate. A family could live off 160 acres of farmland.

But the problem was when they hit the West, when these settlers came out, they started getting into the West, where 160 acres does not even feed a cow.

The people came back to Washington, D.C. and said we have a problem. Our idea of encouraging people to move west and settling the frontier through our Homestead Act is working in this part of the Nation. But when we come to the West, where the land is much more arid, for example, much more rugged terrain, where those mountain peaks in the Third District of Colorado go beyond 14,000 feet, at that point people are not stopping. They are not tilling the land. In fact, 160 acres will not even feed a cow in this new land we are in.

So they gave some thought to it in Washington, and somebody came up with the idea, well, what we should do, if we give 160 acres, say, in Kansas or Nebraska, maybe what we ought to do is give like 3,000 acres out in the Rocky Mountains, so that they can have a comparable amount of acreage that will feed a like number of cows or a like number of livestock.

But the problem was, they said look, realistically and politically we are not going to be able to give away large amounts of land in the West. Somebody else then said I have got the answer. What we should do in the West, just for formality, let us go ahead, the government, and keep title to the land. Let us go ahead and own the land in the West, and we will let the people use it. A land of many uses. It is called multiple use. That is where the concept of "multiple use" came from, a land of many uses.

This land, the reason it is in government hands, is not, contrary to what some of your radical environmental groups like Earth First may want you to believe, that this land was acquired for all future generations, and we should have hands off, and that for some reason, if you are out here in the East and happen to get there first, you are entitled to utilize and live off the land, but when you come to the West, you are not entitled to those kind of privileges.

The government did not intend this as one huge national wilderness area, for example. The only reason the government retained the ownership of this property was because, realistically and politically, they could not give that much land away to one person. But if you look back historically you will see very clearly that the government intended for the people to still continue to come to this area and they would be able to use the land in many different ways.

Today we have lots of different uses for this land. Obviously, we use our land just the same as you do in Kansas or Nebraska or Florida or Missouri or Vermont. We use our land very similar to that. But we also have lots of different uses. We have National Parks, just like others. We have open space, environments and critical forests.

Our water is very important, and our water in the West, remember, water in the West, which I am going to get into in some detail, the West is an arid area. In the West, we sue. We fight. Water is like blood in the West. In the East, in a lot of places, you have to fight to get rid of the water. Shove it over on your neighbor's land. In the West, you try and grab it on your land. So there are some differences there.

This points out for you what we face in the western United States, and that is that oftentimes in our land use policies, on our really everyday life out in the West, whether it is our highways that come over Federal lands, whether it is our power lines, whether it is our water, whether it is our tourism industry, our ski areas, our river rafting, mountain bikes, hiking, our kayaking, all of this, we all of a sudden have a landlord who is in a little tiny town here on the Potomac, Washington, D.C.

Very few of these States in the East, when they decide what they want to have for hiking, or where the mountain bikes are going to go, or, obviously most States do not have ski areas, but what other kind of recreational things they are going to do, they do not have to go to Washington, D.C. for permission. A lot of what we do in the West, we have to come east to the population area of Washington, D.C. to get permission to do it.

So my purpose tonight in kind of explaining the difference between the western United States and the eastern United States is to tell you that when you hear those of us in the West talk about public lands and talk about the impact of, say, wilderness areas, or logging, you listen to us, that you will give us a little time to tell our side of the story.

Over the years, we have gotten pretty good managers of this land, both from an environmental point of view, both from what we have learned from a technical point of view, both of what we have learned on how to manage our resources. And I think it is safe to say that there are a lot more people in the West that know about the land in the West than there probably are in the East, but sometimes in the West it is felt that they are being dictated to by people who have never experienced the West, or by people that do not feel the pain because they do not live on public lands.

In my district, for example, I think with the exception of one or two communities, every community in my district is completely surrounded by government lands. We have to get government permission for highways, we have

to get government permission for recreational uses, we have to get government permission for open space, for endangered species, for water usage, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So there is a difference.

Let us move on and kind of focus in from a national picture. Actually, before we move to the State of Colorado, this is probably a good chart to take a look at, a comparison of some western and eastern States by the percentage of land, public land usage.

In 11 western States, and we picked 11 eastern States to compare side-by-side, so that those of you in the States of New York, for example, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Vermont, et cetera, we are kind of doing a side-by-side comparison in the West. So you have an idea of how public lands impact us much greater, to a much, much greater degree in the West than it does you in the East.

Again, the primary reason that we are impacted in the West and you escape the impact in the East is that historical knowledge that the only way they could encourage people to go in and use large amounts of land in the West was for the government to retain ownership.

Let us take a look. The State of Nevada, 82.9 percent, almost 83 percent of the State of Nevada is public lands, 83 percent. Connecticut, less than one-tenth of 1 percent, one-tenth of 1 percent is public lands. Rhode Island, about three-tenths of 1 percent. New York, seven-tenths of 1 percent.

So colleagues from Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Maine, Massachusetts, 1.3 percent. And this is where my friends, the Frassoos, Tony and Kathy and Dave, live, and I told them, 1.3 percent of your lands are public lands.

Take a look at what Colorado has. Thirty-six percent of Colorado is public lands. By the way, most of that 36 percent is in my Congressional District, the Third District of Colorado.

Look at the State of Utah. Sixty-four percent of the State of Utah belongs to the government. Those are public lands. Idaho, 61 percent. Oregon, the government owns over half that State. Wyoming, the government owns almost half that State. Arizona, almost half of the State of Arizona. Just under half of the State of California. Again, I just mentioned Colorado.

Let us go back over here. In the State of Ohio, a very large State, less than 1.3 percent of your State is owned by the government. So, for my colleagues here from the State of Ohio, you need to listen when somebody like our colleagues from the State of Nevada, who have 83 percent of their State owned by the government, come to speak to you about public lands. Listen to them. I know most of my colleagues do. But we need to have a better understanding of the difficulties that we face in the West, because they are unique to the West. Our everyday lives, the things that impact us be-

cause of government lands are unique to the West versus the East, I think this chart pretty well indicates some of that.

Now, let us go ahead and take a brief look at who some of the major government agencies that have these holdings are, major U.S. landholdings. The Federal Government owns more than 31 percent of all the lands in the United States. So if you take all the lands of this country, the government owns just under one-third of them.

State-owned, for all purposes, 197 million acres. Federally-owned, 704 million acres in this country are owned by the Federal Government. The BLM owns about 260 million acres, the Forest Service owns 231 million acres, and other Federal agencies own about 130 million acres. The Park Service has 75 million acres. The Native American tribes have about 45 million acres.

That is a lot of land. Most of us, when we talk about buying a new home, we think you are doing pretty well if you have a home that sits on a one-acre piece. Imagine, 704 million acres owned by the government, and the majority of that acreage, by far, the strong majority of that acreage, is in the West, where we live.

Now let us focus down on the State of Colorado. A very similar analogy applies to the State of Colorado between eastern Colorado and western Colorado. Now, they are very similar in that eastern Colorado is rural and western Colorado is rural. But if you go down the line, which basically is the Third Congressional District, you will see out here, go back here, in the colored areas, brown, green, blue and so on, those are government lands.

Take a look at western Colorado, right here, versus eastern Colorado. Eastern Colorado, there are very few public lands. In fact, the public lands really literally in some of these counties are the courthouse.

□ 2100

Down here you have some grasslands. You got national grassland up here, in an area over there; but primarily, most of the western slope of Colorado, most of it is owned by the government. That means that the people that live out in this area have to adapt to living and cooperating and working alongside the owners of the property, which is the government. And that has some huge impacts.

You can see why people in the West get a little defensive when somebody from the East starts dictating to them how the land in the West should be handled, especially when the people from the East speak of little experience, especially when the person from the East has never lived this.

For example, I always used to get aggravated when Clinton and Gore, when they spoke to us, they spoke to us about the West; and they would go out and make these grand announcements or by executive orders take large blocks of land and, in essence, put them off limits.

Why was I was upset? Not necessarily because of the fact that some of these moves were not good moves. In fact, some areas did deserve that, the executive order, not many, but some of them did. What bothered me the most is that the President and the Vice President outside of a vacation day or outside of a campaign had never spent a night in the West.

They did not know what our life was like. They did not know what the experience was like having to get government permission, for example, for the water you own, to use that water that you own. It goes on and on and on.

So I think at this point what I want to do is break down and go from our comments about the public lands and what impact the public lands have on the West to talk about a specific asset that we have got in the West, and it is very unique to the West, as far as the law is concerned, as far as the amount of it and the recycling of it and that is the subject of water.

Water is very unique. Water is one of the few resources we have in this country that is renewable. Remember that you often hear people talk, look, let us have conservation on water. Remember water is the one resource, it is the one resource out there that one person's waste of water could very easily be another person's water.

Let me give you an example. Years ago they came out with the idea, well, let us go and let us line all the farmers; ditches with concrete. And that way we will save water from being seeped into the ground. What some did not realize is that the water that leaked out of the one ditch may very well have been the water that popped up as a spring in a piece of property miles away.

Water, we do not understand today but we have a pretty good idea; but 20 years or 30 years from now, we will be able to actually track-specific water and see all the millions of veins that it goes in underneath our earth's surface, and how it benefits one party and yet hurts another party, et cetera, et cetera.

But in the meantime, let us talk a little more about it. It is the only natural resource with automatic renewal. After falling from clouds as rain and snow, it may run into streams, lakes, or soaking into the ground. Eventually, it will evaporate and continues the cycle forever.

Now, here is some interesting statistics. If you take a look at all of the water in the world, all the water on the earth, 97 percent of that water, 97 percent of that water is salt water, and 75 percent of the remainder, so if you take the 3 percent of the earth's water that is not salt water, 75 percent of that 3 percent is actually water that is contained in the polar ice regions as ice caps.

As we put here, only .05 percent, only .05 percent is fresh water in streams and lakes. So when you take a look at the earth's surface under today's technology, the majority of water is salt

water; or it is tied up in the polar ice caps. So that makes water a pretty precious resource.

Here is another interesting number. Seventy-three percent of the stream flow, so almost three-fourths of the stream flow in this country, is claimed by States that are east of a line drawn north to south along the Kansas-Missouri border. In other words, in the eastern United States, remember where I explained the differences here, in the eastern United States, 73 percent of the water in the streams in this entire country, three-fourths of the water is over in this area of the country, over in the eastern part of the country.

This is an arid part of the Nation, these government lands, the western States. Twelve percent is claimed by the Pacific Northwest. This leaves 14 percent of the total stream flow to be shared by 14 States which are over half the land area.

What I am saying here is that 14 percent, 14 percent of the stream flow of water resources in this entire Nation, 14 percent of it has to be shared by over half of the Nation in the western States. So geographically over half the physical size, over half the size of the country only gets 14 percent of the stream flow.

So that shows you why water has become such a precious resource in the West. One of the interesting things about water, and I know to some of you, the subject of discussing water gets pretty boring. In fact, I am going to have a sip of it right now, because we all expect water to be there when we turn on the tap.

It is kind of a boring subject until water no longer comes out of the faucet, then it becomes somewhat more of an issue. And as we begin to make huge advancements in water quality, as we begin to make huge advancements in aquatic life in our water, in better ways to utilize our water, in more efficient ways to utilize water, water becomes more of an important subject.

But I have some very interesting facts which I thought I would present this evening to my colleagues so that you have kind of an idea of how much water is required in our everyday lives, not water just for drinking, but water for our clothes, water for our food, water for our vegetation, et cetera, et cetera.

I think one of the best charts I have seen is this one on water usage. This is the per-person drinking and cooking every day. Every person in America uses about 2 gallons of water to drink and to cook with. Flushing the toilet takes 5 gallons to 7 gallons.

Now interestingly enough, the Europeans, and I am not a big fan necessarily of some of the Europeans' technology, but some of the technology, especially when it comes to toilets they now have a dual flush toilet, a flush when you go one way, a flush when you go another way. That is a pretty smart idea. It helps conserve water. They use excess water to complete the job, so to speak.

The washing machine uses 20 gallons when you turn on your washing machine. A dishwasher to wash your dishes takes 25 gallons; taking a shower, 9 gallons.

Now, take a look at this. I find this part of the chart fascinating, take a look at how much water it takes, for example, for one loaf of bread, for one loaf of bread that you buy off the grocery store shelf, it takes 150 gallons of water to bring that seed up, to process the wheat, to bring the flour, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. It takes 150 gallons of water to produce one loaf of bread.

Take a look at one egg. This is unbelievable, one egg, to have one egg produced, you go through about 120 gallons of water. Thank goodness water is recyclable. Thank goodness it is a commodity that is rechargeable.

One quart of milk, to get 1 quart of milk, you need 223 gallons; or to get 1 gallon of milk, you need 1,000 gallons of water, a thousand gallons of water to produce 1 gallon of milk.

These are numbers that most people never heard of before. A pound of tomatoes, it is 125 gallons of water. A pound of oranges is 47 gallons. A pound of potatoes takes 23 gallons of water.

Now, what happens? This gives you a pretty good idea in the use of our country where the primary use of water is, water that is consumed for human consumption. What happens to 50 glasses of water?

If we have 50 glasses of water in our country that we were going to use for human consumption purposes, this is not water left in the stream or et cetera, this is water for human consumption, 44 of those 50 glasses of water are necessary for agriculture.

That points out to you just how important water is for our agricultural base in this country, three glasses of it is used by industry, two glasses are used by the cities and a half a glass is used out in the country for the people that live out in the country.

Pretty interesting statistics. Well, let me move from the charts that we have here and talk just a little bit more about the State of Colorado and the rivers that we have in Colorado.

First of all, I thought it would be appropriate in our capitol in Denver, Colorado. By the way, it is a beautiful building if you have an opportunity. If you are in Denver, stop by the State capitol. I have many good friends that work out of the State capitol. I served there myself.

One of the best sayings you will find in the capitol is by Thomas Hornsby Ferril: "Here is a land where life is written in water. The West is where water was and is father and son of old mother and daughter following rivers up immensities of range and desert thirsting the sundown ever crossing a hill to climb still drier naming tonight a city by some river a different name from last night's camping fire. Look to the green within the mountain cup. Look to the prairie parched for water lack. Look to the sun that pulls the

oceans up. Look to the cloud that gives the oceans back. Look to your heart and may your wisdom grow to the power of lightning and peace of snow."

I think that poetic piece says it pretty well. In the West, water is like blood. In the West, our entire life is dependent on this resource. We need to understand it. We need to take care of our water resources. We need to keep people from preventing us from using water in a balanced fashion.

We need to be smart enough to keep our water clean and to figure out how to put our water to the best possible use. We need to be fair in our usage of water.

Take a look. In Colorado history, the first dam. Now, you hear lots of criticisms about dams, especially by organizations that generally are way off the spectrum, as far as balance is concerned. In the West, we are very dependent upon dams. In the West, we do not have lots of rainfall.

In fact, I think in Colorado I can tell you exactly in Colorado. In Colorado I think we average about 16 inches of precipitation a year, 16 inches a year. Take a look at what happened in Houston last week.

Now, I know that was a freak storm; but what did they have, 40 inches in a storm, 3 days or 4 days? We do not have 16 inches in an entire year.

The critical thing about water in the West, because we do not have a continual flow, because we do not have lots of rain in the West, we have to store the water that we have, primarily in the Rocky Mountains. We are dependent on our snowfall, the heavy snowfall that we get in the winter time; and then it is that spring runoff that comes off the mountains. A lot of times the runoff may come too early or the runoff may come in too great a surge, so we have to have the capability to store that water, to help us with flood control, to help us so that we have those resources in the months that we do not have any snow, in the months that we do not have spring runoff, in the months that we do not have much rainfall.

So storage of water is critical for life in the West. Now, that is not to say that we should store it at any cost. It is to say that we can store water in a smart and balanced fashion. It is interesting to hear that, that, for example, the National Sierra Club, their number one goal, or at least their number one goal last year was to take down the massive water projects in the West, Lake Powell, which is also one of our largest hydroproducers. Give me a break.

The West could not survive without reservoirs like that. In the West, we need to store that water. Understand, in the East, in many cases, you need to get rid of it. In the West, we need to store it. And our first dam actually in Colorado, our first storage was by the Mesa Verde Indians, and it was that ancient irrigation system.

They actually discovered that around 1,000 A.D. that the Indian groups there

stored water, the Native Americans at Mesa Verde, they figured out that they had arid months. In fact, it is often thought that the extinction of that tribe down in that part of the State was a result of a drought, was a result of the fact that they could not store enough water to get themselves all the way through.

So there is a lot of history to the Rocky Mountains, and there is a lot of history to our water use in the Rocky Mountains. We have what they call Colorado the Mother of Rivers, that is what they call the State, because we have four major river basins in the State of Colorado. The first river basin is called the South Platte; the second, the Arkansas; the third, the Rio Grande; and the fourth, the Colorado River.

I am going to really focus on the Colorado River basin this evening with the time that I have left. Remember, rivers east of the Continental Divide, most of the Continental Divide is in my congressional district. We have all heard, colleagues, of the Continental Divide.

Rivers east of the Divide flow into the Gulf of Mexico. Rivers west of the Divide, like the Colorado River, drain into the Gulf of California and the Pacific Ocean. The Colorado River is a pretty unique river. First of all, the Colorado River is 1,440 miles long. It provides water for 25 million people. The Colorado River provides water for 25 million people, and that river which drains and provides millions of acres of agricultural water, it also provides clean hydropower. And in Colorado, we put in about 75 percent of the water resources for the Colorado River, although actually only about 25 percent of it is allowed to stay.

□ 2115

So the reason that water is so critical for us, aside from the fact that we have to store it, aside from the fact that we do not have much precipitation in our State, is that our water from our agriculture, our water for our recreation, we do everything, from our wild and scenic streams for tourism to our kayaking to our rafting to our snow making, we are very, very dependent on a very limited supply of water in the West. And so I thought that it would be good this evening to talk about water in the West.

I started this evening's comments by talking about the vast amounts of government land that sits in the West, and then transitioned into water in the West, which is one of the key ingredients. I intend in future comments to talk in a little more detail about the public lands, about the need for wilderness areas, about the need for grazing areas and the need for public interest areas, about the need for national parks and State parks, and about the need for open space. So my discussions this evening about water are just one segment in an educational series of how life in the West really is different than the East.

Now, my comments are not meant to put a divide between the East and the West. It simply is to explain the divide that already exists as a result primarily because of geographical differences, and that is where we have that. So this is my purpose. Water is our subject this evening.

I want to give a couple of other comments about water that I think are pretty interesting. First of all, as many of my colleagues may know, we have wonderful trout streams in Colorado. In fact, in the State of Colorado we have over 9,000 miles of streams; 9,000 miles coming off those great big mountains, those high mountains of the Colorado Rockies. We also have about 2,000 lakes and reservoirs. We are not like Minnesota or Michigan with those massive lakes, but considering the height, the elevation of the Rocky Mountains, Colorado is a really fairly unique State.

We have a lot of fun things in Colorado. For example, we have 13 different streams, called Clear Creek. But the key is that while there are differences in the United States between the east and the west, those differences also exist in the State of Colorado between eastern Colorado, primarily the cities, and western Colorado. My congressional district, for example, the third district of the State of Colorado, that district has 80 percent of the water resources in Colorado, yet 80 percent of the population resides outside that district. So within our own boundaries even in the State of Colorado there is a constant balancing requirement that is necessary. How much water should be diverted from the western slope to the eastern slope? What amount of water do we need to keep in the streams to preserve our aquatic life or the quality of the water? These are issues we deal with every day in the West.

My purpose in being here this evening, especially to my colleagues east of Colorado, to the Atlantic Ocean, is to request of them that when they hear about or have an opportunity to vote on water issues facing the West, ask some of us in the West about it, because the implications in the West on water in many, many cases are dramatically different than the implications on a water vote when we are discussing water in the East.

Now, tomorrow evening, or later this week, I hope to talk a little about energy. Because energy, of course, involves all of us. It is very important. I also want to talk about public lands in some more detail, the different uses of public lands, the different ways the government manages public lands.

We have lots of different management tools with public lands. When our government said, as I mentioned earlier in my comments, that in the East we would let the people own the land, but in the West the government would keep the title for the land simply to avoid the political embarrassment of giving away too much land, when the government did that, they decided that

they were going to retain and manage this land. And over the time, through technological management, through better land management, through more knowledge, we have developed a vast array of tools, and we can use any one of these tools or a combination of these tools to help us manage these public lands.

Many of my colleagues are aware of some of these tools, the names of these tools, such as national parks, for example, national monuments, special interest areas, conservation areas, et cetera, et cetera. Well, what we need to do to properly manage these massive Federal lands is not to make a rule that one shoe fits all, because one shoe does not fit all in the West. What we need to do is custom manage these public lands, but we cannot custom manage public lands unless we talk to the people who live there. We cannot custom manage public lands unless we talk to the people who are directly impacted by it.

Now, it is true, and I hear this argument constantly from my colleagues here on the floor that land belongs to all the people in the West, so those of us in decision-making authority here in the East have every right to make decisions on how people in the West live and how they use that land. That is not how we get a balanced approach for the management of public lands in the West. The way to do it is to go to the local communities.

For example, today in front of the subcommittee that I chair, the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health of the Committee on Resources, we had a Native American who spoke about the years of history of his family and the traditions regarding the uses of the forest and the uses of government lands. We had an expert on forest that talked about the health of different public lands. Both of these people stressed in their comments the importance of having local input, the importance of bringing in the people who are impacted by these public lands.

So tomorrow night I will go into a lot more detail. I will talk about probably the most extreme use, the strongest tool we have, called wilderness designation. And by the way, I have probably put more land in wilderness than anybody currently seated in the House of Representatives. And then I will go clear to the other extreme, where the land is not properly managed, where the land is kind of a free-for-all, which is as much a disservice as an extreme on the other end.

There are lots of different tools and lots of ways that we can preserve these lands for future generations while at the same time having the right to live on them and enjoy them in this generation. This generation is not under an obligation to save everything for the future. There are a lot of things that we can use. And if we use them smartly, we not only mitigate our impact to the environment, in many cases we can enhance the environment. And that is where our obligation is, to help enhance our environment. I will talk a

little more about that tomorrow evening.

For my final few minutes, even though I will address it later in the week, I want to talk a little about energy. We have talked this evening about a number of different things. First of all, we started with a few comments on the Patients' Bill of Rights, and I want to restress to my colleagues that it is important that patients have rights in this country. It is important that we do not have gross mismanagement of our medical services in this country. It is important that we have a balance out there.

And when we hear in the press and we see documents that say the Patients' Bill of Rights, we should take a look at the details. It may work out to be just what we are looking for. It may be an answer for some of the problems. But we need to read the details before signing on to the document. We need to read the details before casting our votes, because we have an obligation in these Chambers to be aware of the impact that these bills will have and to take a look at what might be the unintended consequences of actions that we might take.

So we have spent a few minutes talking about the Patient's Bill of Rights, and then, of course, I moved on and talked about public lands and water resources. Now, colleagues, I know that that is kind of a boring subject. I know this evening's walk through the differences between the East and the West in the United States, where in the West we have massive amounts of Federal Government land ownership and in the East we have very little government land ownership, and the differences that can even be pared down to the State, where we talk about differences in water and differences in government-owned lands and public lands, but while it is boring, it is very important. Life in the West is also important for those in the East, because we are totally dependent upon an understanding so that we can help preserve and utilize in a proper fashion these resources.

Finally, now, I want to visit for a couple of minutes in my remaining time about energy and the need for energy. First of all, I am a strong believer in conservation. I think there are a lot of things that the American public can do to help conserve. I was at a town meeting yesterday in Frisco, Colorado, when somebody brought up the fact that they were in Europe recently, and mentioned that when they went into a room, in order to keep the lights on, they, naturally could turn them on, but in order for them to stay on, they had to take a card and put the card in a slot. Now, I had been in Europe, too, and I remembered that as he said that. When leaving the house, once you pulled the card out to leave the house, the lights shut off. It is a tremendous energy saver and it is of no pain.

We do not have to have our lives inconvenienced at all. One switch shuts

them all off. Now, of course, I imagine that if you need a security light and so on, that can be worked out. But there are little ideas like this, like changing our oil every 6,000 miles on our cars instead of every 3,000. There are lots of simple conservation ideas that we, the American people, can employ today. For example, as we prepare to retire this evening, make sure we do not have on the bathroom light, the closet light, and the bedroom light. When we are in the kitchen getting ready to have a drink of water before going to bed, shut off lights. We can turn down our heaters, if we do not need them. We can keep the air conditioner turned up if we do not need it that cold in rooms.

One of the things that helps us do this, that helps us conserve, is the marketplace. Now, I have heard a lot of talk about, well, we need to artificially support these prices. But the thing that has driven more conservation in the last couple of months has not been some action by the government, it has been high prices in the marketplace. If we were to freeze the price of energy, which some of my colleagues recommend we do, i.e. price caps, that does several things. One, it encourages people to use more of the product because they know that the price will not go up on them. Two, it discourages innovation. What drives innovation is that when prices go up and demand stays the same or goes up, people look for more efficient ways to do things. So energy and conservation are very important.

I agree very strongly with people like the Vice President, who I think, although it may not be politically correct in some audiences in our country, makes it very clear that conservation alone will not answer our shortage of energy in this country; that conservation alone will not lessen the dependency we have on foreign oil; that conservation alone, while it is a very, very important factor, it is not the sole answer. We have got to figure out ways to use and to gather more resources for energy for future generations. Energy is a big issue for us.

I actually think that the energy shortage that we are in really is kind of a wake-up call for us. It is not a crisis for the entire country where the economy has collapsed, but it is a wake-up call. It is the alarm going off saying time to wake up, time to take a look at what kind of dependency we have on foreign oil, what kind of conservation we are employing or deploying in our country. So I think from that aspect it has done us some good.

Let me kind of conclude these remarks, because I intend to go into more detail about energy, by asking my colleagues not to let people convince them that the needs of this country can be met simply by conservation. On the other hand, do not let anybody convince you that conservation does not have an important role to play. We can conserve. And a lot of people throughout the world, but more par-

ticularly in this country, can conserve without pain. In fact, a lot of the ways we conserve actually save us money, like shutting the lights off when we are not using them.

□ 2130

Change your oil less frequently, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. You actually save money as a result of that, colleagues. So conservation and exploration are necessary elements for this country to meet the demands that the people of this country have come to expect. And I think we have an obligation to do that. A lot depends on energy. Our lives are dependent on energy, whether it is energy from hydropower, to drive our vehicles, to air conditioning, refrigeration, et cetera, et cetera.

Energy is an important policy. What this wake-up call has also done, we have had more energy debates and comments on this House floor in the last 6 weeks than we have had in the last 6 years. The Clinton administration had absolutely no energy policy. What President Bush has done, what the Bush administration has done, is said we have to have an energy policy. Let us put everything on the table. When you put some things on the table, people squeal like a stuck pig. We do not have to accept it, but we ought to debate it and think it out and determine what ought to stay on the table and come off the table. That is how you develop policy. It is debate on this House floor that helps form policy.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Bush administration that this country needs an energy policy. We, the American people, colleagues, the people that we represent, deserve to have an energy policy. That means a policy that has thoroughly investigated the resources, including conservation, the resources out there for us.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time that I have been able to share with my colleagues this evening. I look forward to sharing further and having further discussion about public lands and talking more about energy.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the House has concluded its activities for the day, and I thank the gentleman from Colorado for taking time to update us on the important issues that he finds not only in his tutelage as a Member of Congress from Colorado, but also as an important Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to talk about something that is very important. It is called the Patients' Bill of Rights. It is an important issue that the House of Representatives and the other body will be taking up. The issue

of the Patients' Bill of Rights is one that is of importance not only to consumers, but it is also important to physicians. It is important to health care providers; it is important to insurance providers. It is important to Members of Congress because we recognize that today in health care across this country that there are some unresolved issues and some changes that have not taken place in the Nation. The Nation, unfortunately, is looking to Washington, D.C. to attempt to solve some of these problems.

Tonight I would like to float a new concept or idea which I believe will become part of the health care debate. We are all aware that by and large Republicans and Democrats, Members of this body, have come to an agreement on many things that will be necessary to solve the health care problem. Things like access to emergency rooms and making sure that sick people are taken care of and having doctors make decisions and making general reform under the Patients' Bill of Rights, but the impediment or the stopping point, why we have not been able to resolve this matter rests on the issue of liability. The issue of liability or accountability is one that has not been fully seen through with an answer.

Mr. Speaker, part of the problem goes back to something that is called ERISA, which is an act from 1974, an act that provides companies that have or do business across State lines the ability to give them a chance to have an insurance policy, a savings plan and other types of arrangements for their employees on a nationwide basis rather than looking directly at how they might comply with 50 State insurance commissioner plans or 50 State plans related to savings plans.

Because of ERISA, what is called ERISA preemption, it means that health care providers do not have to comply exactly because of this exemption that they have in the marketplace to liability issues. It gives them an exemption from being sued essentially in the marketplace.

So there are some HMOs that may or may not provide service that would be consistent with State plans, and so there is a call for us to level that playing field and decide how that is going to work.

Mr. Speaker, the answer that is generally accepted is that you just allow HMOs to be sued so that the consumer or a doctor's decision is taken into account and corrected.

We, as Members of this body, deliberated on this effort. Last year I voted for something called the Norwood-Dingell bill, which would allow this to take place, where a body, that is an HMO, could be sued for a decision that they would be making in health care. The inability that we have for this body to decide today how that lawsuit would take place, whether it would be caps or an unlimited amount of money, whether it would be suing in Federal court or State court, who would be

making medical decisions, whether medical decisions would be a part of this or whether it would be for harm, are things that have been widely debated.

The idea that I would like to discuss tonight is how we can go about resolving this. Essentially my plan that will be put forward is one that says that I believe that we should not skew the marketplace. We in fact want to have employers be protected when they do not make medical decisions. We do not want employers to be sued. We do not want lawsuits that would take money from health care and cause an incredible amount of draining off of resources out of health care to take place. So we want to protect employers. We want doctors to make decisions. We want doctors to make the decisions that they have been trained to do that are medically necessary.

We want to make sure as a public policy perspective that we are able to move on and give every single patient those things that they need and not hold up the delivery of those changes so that customers can, consumers can have what they need.

Mr. Speaker, my plan is simple. It separates process from harm. It says that we will not allow lawsuits as part of a difference that might take place between an HMO and a consumer, an HMO and a doctor. We will not allow those to go to a lawsuit where there is a nonharm that has been placed as a difference between these circumstances.

Why is this important? It is important because I do not believe that we should solve our differences in a court of law, but rather we should be dynamic in understanding that a doctor should be the one who is making the decisions about nondamage differences in the marketplace. So my bill will separate what I call process from harm.

The process would be, as has been accomplished in many States around the country, where there is a difference between a consumer, a patient, a doctor, and a health care provider, we would allow an internal and an external review, the internal review meaning that we would allow the HMO the opportunity to understand what their difference is and that they would have to respond back with a physician's answer, but that the final decision in this would be made by an external review, a panel that was made up of three expert physicians in this field. I believe it is important that we allow doctors to make medical decisions and not look to courts to do that.

On the other side of the coin where we deal with harm, I believe it is important that we go to a court of law, that we allow a harmed party an opportunity not only to go to a court to address these issues, but to be in front of a jury. That is where the other part of my bill will allow a party, a harmed party, to go to State court to resolve their differences.

It is my hope that this process that we are beginning will allow us an op-

portunity to move forward in a bipartisan way to address the issues and give patients those things that they need, address them under the Patients' Bill of Rights and also address them under liability.

PRESIDENT BUSH HAS HISTORIC MEETING WITH PRESIDENT PUTIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to provide some information from the standpoint of one Member of Congress following President Bush's recent meeting with European leaders, and in particular with his historic meeting with Russian President Putin.

I wanted to take out this special order for a number of reasons; first of all, to follow up on the discussions that were held by our President and the Russian president, and talk about the substance of those discussions; and also, on the eve of the visit of the first elected delegation to arrive in Washington following that summit, which I will host tomorrow with my colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and members of the Duma Congressional Study Group here in Washington. In fact we have the First Deputy Speaker of the Russian Duma, the highest elected official in the Duma, representing President Putin's party. And as the number two person of the Duma, she is the leader of the delegation here in Washington tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the delegation of elected Russian leaders includes representation of political factions in the Duma, and are here to have formal discussions with us as a part of our ongoing dialogue. Over the past 9 years since forming the study group, we have had scores of meetings both in Washington and Moscow and throughout each of our respective countries trying to find common ground on key issues which face America and Russia.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me follow the meeting that was held between our two Presidents. There were many who said American and Russian relations were in fact becoming sour; that because of actions, especially President Bush's speech on missile defense, that perhaps Russia was no longer willing to be a friend of ours.

□ 2145

There was a lot of speculation that perhaps President Bush did not have a sensitivity relative to our relations with Russia; that perhaps President Putin was taking Russia in a different direction; that in fact America and Russia were doomed to become enemies again; and that Russia in fact was moving to become a closer ally with China and enemies of Russia as opposed to being our friend.

All during the past year in meeting with our new President, I was convinced that he understood what it would take to bring back a normalization of our relations. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that President Putin felt the same way. In fact, last summer I was contacted by the then chairman of President Putin's political party in the Duma, Boris Grislov. He contacted me because he wanted to come over and observe the Republican convention and build relationships between the Republican Party, and in particular our candidate, and the party of President Putin, the "Edinstvo" Faction or Unity Faction. I extended an invitation to Boris Grislov. He came to Philadelphia and spent the week with Members of Congress observing our convention, speaking to the Russian people through a media source that had come with him and understanding how our democracy worked and building ties with Republicans who were in Philadelphia.

He came back again in January of this year, again at my invitation, to visit and to observe the inauguration of our new President. We got him special passes and he observed and witnessed the inauguration of George W. Bush. Then he hosted a delegation that I took along with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) to Moscow approximately 10 weeks ago. The gentleman from Maryland and the delegation that traveled with us and I did an extensive 1-hour summary of that trip when we returned.

The point is that President Putin and his party wanted to reach out and establish a new relationship. Even though the media was reporting a souring of relations between Russia and the U.S., I was convinced that in the end once President Bush met face to face with President Putin, we would have a new beginning. In fact, when I was on Air Force One with President Bush right before my trip to Moscow 9 weeks ago, I said to President Bush on the plane, Mr. President, if I have a chance to meet with President Putin, which I may, and I certainly will meet with his leaders, what do you want me to tell him?

He said, CURT, you tell President Putin that I am looking forward to meeting him, that we have no quarrel with Russia, we want to be their friend. We have some differences, but we can work those out.

That is exactly what happened in the meeting between President Putin and President Bush this past weekend. I think they have struck a relationship that is good for both countries and good for the world. Now, there are problems. In fact, there is a great deal of lack of trust on the part of the Russian side. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of my colleagues to this collage of photographs that I assembled from news sources of street scenes in downtown Moscow a little over a year ago. The scenes are not very positive. You see Russians throwing rocks at the American embassy in

Moscow. You see young Russians holding up anti-USA signs. You see Russians putting a swastika on the American flag. And you see Russians burning the American flag. This was a part of a major demonstration of over 10,000 Russians against America.

Why did they do this? Was this because of President Bush's announcement about missile defense? No, Mr. Speaker. This demonstration occurred during the previous administration. Well, then why were they protesting so aggressively in the streets, because we have been led to believe that the Russian problem is with missile defense which President Bush announced we were moving aggressively into? That is not the problem that has caused a lack of trust in Russia, Mr. Speaker. It is a combination of several factors, the results of which President Bush has inherited.

First of all, the Russians were not properly briefed when we expanded NATO a few short years ago to get the full picture that NATO was not the natural enemy of Russia any longer. Now, President Bush went to great lengths on this recent trip to explain to the Russian people and the Russian leaders that NATO was not meant to be the enemy of Russia any longer and that in fact NATO expansion was meant to provide a more secure Europe. In fact, President Bush left the door open that, one day, if Russia chose and if she met the criteria, she too could become a member of NATO. But when we expanded NATO a few years ago, that was not the case. The Russian people were given the feeling by the way we mishandled it that perhaps it was an attempt to bring in those former Soviet allies and now make them enemies of Russia.

The second reason why the people in Moscow were demonstrating is because of the war in Kosovo. Russians were convinced that that war caused a tremendous loss of innocent lives, of innocent Serbs. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, myself and a group of our colleagues also disagree with the way that we got involved in the Kosovo conflict. It was not that we liked Milosevic. It was not that we thought Milosevic was some kind of a person that we should respect and honor. We felt that he was as much of a thug and a corrupt individual and leader as everyone else did in this body.

But our reason for disagreeing with the leadership of President Clinton and Prime Minister Tony Blair of Great Britain in going in and attacking the former Yugoslavia was that we had not given Russia a chance to use its influence in getting Milosevic out of power peacefully. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was the one that led an 11-member delegation of five Democrats and five Republicans and myself to Vienna where we met with leaders of the Russian Duma from all the factions along with those who support Milosevic, and we were able to work out the framework that became the basis of the G-8 agreement

that eventually ended that conflict peacefully.

The Russians, and myself included, believe we could have ended that war and should have ended it much earlier, in fact should never have begun it in the first place and should have allowed and actually should have encouraged Russia, should have forced Russia to play a more aggressive role in peacefully removing Milosevic from power, not one year after we began the bombing but a matter of weeks after the allied nations would have worked with Russia. That was a second reason that the Russian people lost confidence in us.

But I think perhaps the most important reason the Russian people lost confidence in us is because over the past 5 years, they know that we saw billions of dollars of IMF money, International Monetary Fund money, World Bank money and in some cases U.S. taxpayer dollars going into Russia for legitimate purposes but ending up being siphoned off by corrupt leaders who in fact were friends of Boris Yeltsin, by corrupt institutions that were led by the oligarchs that had been hand-selected by Boris Yeltsin.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, 4 and 5 years ago, we were aware that corruption was running rampant in Moscow. We were made aware as Members of Congress that those people hand picked by Yeltsin to run the banking system in Russia were corruptly taking money that was supposed to benefit Russia's people and instead putting it in U.S. real estate investments and Swiss bank accounts. The problem was, Mr. Speaker, that our policy for the past 8 years under the previous administration with Russia was based on a personal friendship between President Clinton and President Yeltsin. Now, I am not against personal friendships. In fact, I think it is helpful; and hopefully President Bush and President Putin will become close friends. But President Clinton had become such a close friend of Boris Yeltsin that our whole policy for 8 years was based on keeping Yeltsin in power. When we had evidence that there was rampant corruption around Yeltsin, we should have done the right thing. We should have questioned Yeltsin directly, and we should have called him into a public accounting for the billions of dollars of money, much of it backed by the U.S. government and U.S. taxpayers, that was supposed to help the Russian people reform their economy and society but instead was benefiting Boris' personal friends. But we did not do that. We pretended we did not see it. We pretended that we did not know about it.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, in the 2 months before Boris Yeltsin resigned his position, the popularity polls in Moscow and throughout Russia showed that Yeltsin's popularity was only 2 percent. Only 2 percent of the Russian people supported him. But guess who else supported him, the President and Vice President of the United States.

We were still supporting a man that almost every Russian believed was corrupt and had a severe alcohol problem. And as we all know, Mr. Speaker, when Yeltsin finally resigned, one of the conditions for his resignation was that the new President, President Putin, in his first official act would have to give a blanket pardon to Boris Yeltsin and his entire family. That is exactly what President Putin did. His first official act was to pardon President Yeltsin and his family, because the Russian people and leaders in the Duma wanted to go after Yeltsin and those oligarchs for stealing billions of dollars of money that should have gone to help the Russian people.

Further evidence of this were the indictments handed down by the Justice Department in New York just 2 years ago, in the Bank of New York scandal, where the Justice Department has alleged in public documents that individuals in Russia and the U.S. were involved in siphoning off up to \$5 billion of IMF money that should have gone to the Russian people. So a third reason why these Russians were rampaging in the streets against America was because they felt that America let them down.

Now, if you believe the national news media and some of the liberals in this city, including my colleagues in this body and some in the other body, they would have you believe that our problem with Russia today is all about missile defense.

Tonight I want to talk about missile defense, Mr. Speaker, because that is not a problem with Russia. It is not a problem at least the way President Bush wants to move forward with missile defense. Some will say, Well, the Russians do not want us to move forward on missile defense. The Russians do not want us to have that capability. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that Russia has had a missile defense system protecting Moscow and 75 percent of the Russian people for the last 25 years. In fact, they have upgraded that system at least three times and have improved it in terms of accuracy and guidance systems. We have no such missile defense system.

Why would we not have one, Mr. Speaker? Well, the ABM treaty which was negotiated back in 1972 was based on mutually assured deterrence, also called mutually assured destruction. At that time there were only two major superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States. We each had offensive missiles with nuclear warheads on top. And so we dared each other. You attack us and we will wipe you out with a counterattack. And if we attack you, we know that you will wipe us out with a counterattack.

So deterrence was the strategic relationship between two superpowers from 1972 on. But that ABM treaty allowed one missile defense system in each country. The original treaty allowed two, but it was modified after a short period of time to only allow each coun-

try to build one missile defense system. That one system could only protect one city. Russia, because of its geography and because of its control by a Communist dictatorship picked Moscow. It just so happened in the former Soviet Union that Moscow and the environment around Moscow has about 75 percent of the Russian people. So it was fairly easy politically for the Communists in the Soviet Union to decide to protect Moscow with an ABM system, an antiballistic missile system. The people in the far east in the Soviet Union were not happy because they were left vulnerable. But if you are controlled by a Communist dictatorship, it does not matter what the people in the far east think. The Communist leadership determines which city will be protected. So Moscow was protected.

Now, over here in America we are a democracy. Our leaders could not politically pick one city. Which city would we pick? New York? Dallas? Los Angeles? Seattle? If we picked one city to protect, every other part of America would say, wait a minute. This is a democracy, a representative government where all of us are equal. You cannot pick one city and only protect one group of people. And besides, our population is not based in one area. So the ABM treaty, even though it did call and did allow for security through deterrence, did not allow America to provide a level of protection that Russian people have had for the past 25 years.

□ 2200

The difference is that today we no longer live in a world with two superpowers. The Soviet Union does not even consider itself to be a superpower today, even though they have major offensive weapons. So there is one superpower left, and that is us.

The problem with the ABM treaty is that today we have other nations that have the same offensive capability that perhaps the U.S. and Russia have had over the past 30 years. On August 30 of 1998, North Korea did something that even the CIA was not aware they had the capability to do. They launched a three-stage missile up into the atmosphere over Japan. The CIA has acknowledged publicly that they were not aware that North Korea had a three-stage rocket potential. Even though that test did not go to completion, when the CIA analysts projected how far that missile could have traveled they have now said publicly it could reach the shores of the western part of the U.S. It could not carry a very heavy payload and it might not be very accurate, but if one of those North Korean missiles had a small chemical biological or small nuclear warhead, it could hit the western part of the United States. That is the first time in the history of North Korea that a rogue state has had the capability to hit our country directly, and we have no defense against that.

Now it is not that we think that North Korea will attack us, because

most of us do not. But let us imagine a scenario where North Korea might not be on friendly terms with South Korea, and we have seen evidence of that over the past several decades, and perhaps North Korea would attack South Korea. Whereupon, America would come in to help defend South Korea because of treaty relations. What if North Korea's leaders then said to our President, if you do not remove your troops from the Korean Peninsula we are going to nuke one of your western cities? For the first time in the history of the existence of North Korea, we now know they have that capability. It might not be a very accurate missile. They might aim for Los Angeles and hit Portland, but it does not matter. They have that capability.

What would be our President's response? Would we go in preemptively and nuke North Korea and wipe out all their capabilities and kill innocent people, even though they had not attacked us? Or would we wait until they launched the missile, which we could not defend against, and then counter-attack and wipe out North Korea? Which course would our President take, Mr. Speaker?

It presents a kind of dilemma that we never want our President to be in. But it is not just a rogue state like North Korea. Iran has now been working on a system, the Shahab-III, Shahab-IV and Shahab-V, which now possesses a capability of sending a missile about 2,500 kilometers. That covers a good part of Europe. Iran is also working on a missile system called the Shahab-V. That system will have a range, we think, of 5,000 kilometers. Iran's goal is to develop a long-range missile to eventually hit the U.S. Iraq has a similar goal, and they have improved their SCUD missile three or four times. They eventually want to have a capability to use against America.

So we now have other nations that are unstable nations building missiles that within 5 to 10 years will be able to hit the U.S. for which we have no defense. But it is not just those unstable nations, Mr. Speaker, that we are concerned about. President Bush and Members of Congress who support missile defense do not for a minute believe that Russia will attack us. That is not the case. Our colleagues do not believe that China will attack us for that matter.

Let me say what is a concern, Mr. Speaker, and it deals with a missile that I am going to put up on the easel right now.

This photograph, Mr. Speaker, is a Russian SS-25 long-range missile. You can see it is carried on what basically is a tractor-trailer with a number of wheels and tires. This missile, when put in the launch position, when the launch codes are entered, is pre-programmed to an American city and can travel 10,000 kilometers at an approximate time of 25 minutes from the time it is launched to landing on that American city which it has been pre-programmed to strike. Now, the exact

number is classified, but I can say unclassified that Russia has over 400 of these mobile launched SS-25s. Part of their doctrine is to drive them all over their territory so that we do not know where those missiles are at any given time, so there is an act of surprise there, an element of surprise if Russia would need to attack us. It is a basic part of their ICBM fleet.

Now we do not think that Russia will launch these against us deliberately, but let me give you, Mr. Speaker, an incident that did occur in Moscow and in Russia in 1995. Norway, in January of 1995, was going to launch a weather rocket into the atmosphere to sample weather conditions. So the Norwegian government notified the Russian government right next door, do not worry; this missile we are launching is not in any way offensive to you. It is simply a scientific experiment for us to sample upper atmospheric conditions for proper weather reporting.

Because of Russia's economic problems, Mr. Speaker, and because of Russia's lack of improving its sensing systems, when the Norwegians launched that rocket they misread it in Russia. The Russian military thought it was an attack from an American nuclear submarine. So when Norway launched their rocket for weather purposes, the Russian military misread that launch and thought it was an attack from a nuclear submarine off their coast. So the Russian leadership did what they would do if they were being attacked. They put their ICBM fleet on alert, which meant they were within a matter of minutes to launching one missile pre-programmed against an American city. That was their response.

The week after this incident occurred, President Yeltsin was asked by the Russian media, what happened, President Yeltsin? He acknowledged that this took place. He said, yes, it was only one of two times that ICBMs were put on full alert, but it worked; our system worked. I overruled, he said, our defense minister Pavel Grachev and I overruled the general in terms of our command staff, General Kalisnikov, and I called off the launch.

Mr. Speaker, estimates are that Russia was within 7 minutes of accidentally launching a 10,000 kilometer ICBM that would have hit an American city.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us think for a moment. What if that launch would have occurred and what if it occurred under President Putin? Let us imagine a White House conversation between the two presidents. President Putin picks up the red phone, linking him directly up with Washington, and he gets President Bush on the phone and he says, Mr. President, we have had a terrible accident. One of our long-range missiles has been launched accidentally. Please forgive us.

What does President Bush then do? Well, he has two choices. He can then issue a launch code for one of our missiles to take out one of Russia's cities

in retaliation. That would end up in perhaps a half million people being killed in both countries, or he could perhaps go on national TV and tell the American people in the city where that missile was heading that they have 25 minutes to move.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, today America has no system to shoot down an incoming missile. We have no capability to shoot down a missile once it has been launched.

If, likewise, one of these units controlling an SS-25 were to somehow get the launch codes for that missile and launch that missile, again we have no defense against that accident.

Mr. Speaker, that is why President Bush has said America must deploy missile defense. That is why this Congress voted with a veto-proof margin 2 years ago in favor of my bill, H.R. 4, to declare it our national law that we will deploy missile defense. It was not to back Russia into a corner. It was not to escalate an arms race. It was to give us protection against a threat that we do not now have.

Now, the liberal opponents of missile defense will say, well, wait a minute, Congressman WELDON, the threat, and I heard the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee say this on Sunday, there is a more likely threat of a truck bomb coming into our cities.

That is a little bit disingenuous, Mr. Speaker, because the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee knows full well that over the past 6 years the Congress has plussed up funding for dealing with weapons of mass destruction more than what the President asked for each year. We are spending hundred of millions of dollars on new detection systems, new intelligence systems, on dealing with weapons of mass destruction that could be brought in by terrorist groups. We are not ignoring that threat, but, Mr. Speaker, the facts are there. The largest loss of American military life in the past 10 years was when a low complexity SCUD missile was fired by Saddam Hussein into an American military barracks in Bahrain, Saudi Arabia. America let down our sons and daughters. Twenty-eight young Americans came home in body bags because we could not defend against a low complexity SCUD missile.

When Saddam Hussein chose to destroy American lives, he did not pick a truck bomb. He did not pick a chemical agent. He picked a SCUD missile, which he has now enhanced four times. When Saddam Hussein chose to kill innocent Jews in Israel, he did not pick truck bombs. He did not pick biological weapons. He sent SCUD missiles into Israel, and killed and injured hundreds of innocent Jews.

The facts are easily understood, Mr. Speaker. The weapon of choice is the missile. Today throughout the world, over 70 nations possess cruise, medium- and long-range missiles. Twenty-two nations today around the world are building these missiles. All the major

unstable nations are building missile systems today because they want to use them and threaten to use them against America, our allies and our troops.

Now others will say, well, wait a minute, wait a minute. This system will not work. Mr. Speaker, facts again do not support that notion. There have been 31 major tests of missile defense systems by our military over the past 5 years, 31 tests. These tests were with our Army program called THAAD, our PAC III program, the Enhanced Patriot, our Navy program, called Navy Area Wide Navy Upper Tier, and our national missile defense program, 31 tests. Now we had failures, I will acknowledge that, but, Mr. Speaker, the failures were not of hitting a bullet with a bullet. The failures were when we could not get the rocket into the atmosphere.

Now, that problem was solved by Wernher von Braun 40 years ago. If we use that as a reason to stop missile defense, then we better shut down our space program, because the same rocket technology that launches our satellites and our astronauts into outer space is the exact same technology we use for missile defense. So if we think that those failures should stop missile defense, then we should shut down Cape Kennedy, because it is the same rocket science.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, of the 16 times of the 31 tests, where the seeker reached a level where it could see the target up in the atmosphere, 16 times, 14 of those times we hit a missile with a missile. We hit a bullet with a bullet. So our success rate has been 14 out of 16 times we have been able to hit a bullet with a bullet, proving that the technology is, in fact, at hand.

□ 2215

Last week, Mr. Speaker, General Kadish, the head of our Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, a three-star general, testified, and I asked the question, general, is the technology here today? He said, absolutely, Congressman. We understand and have the technology worked out.

I said, is it an engineering challenge now? He said, that is the challenge. It is engineering, a group of systems, the queuing system, the radar system, the Seeker itself, to work together to take out that missile when it is on the ascent phase heading toward our country or our troops. So it is not a technology problem, it is an engineering challenge.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some of the opponents of missile defense will say, well, wait a minute. You can defeat missile defense by having decoys. Any nation that we would try to defend against would simply build decoys. These would be balloons so that you would not be able to tell the warhead from the balloon.

That is an easy argument for people to make, but it does not hold water, Mr. Speaker. It is disingenuous. Because if we have countries that the liberals say cannot build missile systems

because they do not have the capability, how can we expect those same countries to be able to build technologies that would allow them to have decoys?

We tried to build decoys ourselves, and we are the most equipped nation in the world technologically. We have had problems building decoys. So you cannot say a foreign nation can build decoys that we cannot even build as a reason not to move forward with missile defense.

Now, we understand the challenge of being able to differentiate the actual warhead from a decoy. It is a challenge we have not yet totally solved. But, Mr. Speaker, even if we move for aggressive deployment today, we will not have a system in place for at least 5 years. We are on a time frame to solve the challenge of decoys during that time frame of deployment.

Now, some say the system would cost too much money. Mr. Speaker, the cost for missile defense is approximately 1 percent of our defense budget. One percent. Not our total budget, of our defense budget.

Now, we are building new airplanes to replace older ones, we are building new ships to replace older ships. We are building all kinds of new tanks and ammunition to replace older ones. But missile defense does not exist today. One percent of our defense budget to build defenses against missile systems is not too much to ask.

I would say to my colleagues, if you believe cost is a factor, then what price do you put on Philadelphia, or on Los Angeles, or on Washington, D.C.? Is it worth \$1 billion? Is it worth \$100 million? What price do we put on a city that could be wiped out from one missile launched into our country?

So price is not an issue. Technology is not an issue. Well, then what is the issue? Is it the Russians? Yes, we want to reassure Russia that this is not meant to threaten them. Do the Russians not trust us today on missile defense?

Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, if I were a Russian today, I would not trust America on missile defense either. That is a pretty strong statement. Why would I say that? Why would I not trust America on missile defense if I were a Russian?

Because three times in the last 8 years under President Clinton we slapped Russia across the face on missile defense. Let me review the actual incidents one at a time.

In 1992, the new President of Russia, Boris Yeltsin, challenged former President George Bush to work together on missile defense. He said let us have our two countries cooperate. President Bush said, I agree. So our State Department began high level talks with the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Those talks were given a name, Ross-Manedov talks, named after the two people leading the discussions.

We had several meetings, quiet meetings, but very successful meetings. The

two governments were looking at ways to cooperate back in 1992 on missile defense.

Things changed in 1993. A new President came in, a President who ran against missile defense. What was one of the first acts that President Clinton did? With no advance warnings to the Russian side, he abruptly canceled the Ross-Manedov talks. So we sent our first signal to Russia back in 1993, we do not want to work with you on missile defense. We will work alone.

For the support of Congress, we kept one joint missile defense program operational with the Russians. It was the construction of two satellites, one controlled by Russia and one controlled by the U.S., to sense rocket launches around the world, so we could build confidence. The program is called RAMOS, Russian American program for space observations.

In 1996, with no advance warning to the Russians or the Congress, the Clinton administration canceled the program. I got frantic calls in my office from my Russian friends. They said, Congressman WELDON, what is going on? You have told us you are trying to work with us. Your government just announced they are cancelling the funds for the RAMOS program?

Democrats and Republicans in the Congress came together. CARL LEVIN in the Senate, myself in the House, joined by a number of other Members, said this cannot stand. We overturned the Clinton administration's decision to cancel the RAMOS program, and it is still being funded today.

But, you know what Mr. Speaker? That was the second time that Russia got a signal from us. Our administration canceled the program. It was the Congress who restarted it.

There was a third incident. In the late 1990s, with the ending of the two superpowers, the common thought in America was that the ABM Treaty, if it was kept in place, had to become more flexible to allow America to deal with new threats that were emerging.

What did the Clinton administration do? It sent its negotiators to Geneva to negotiate with the Russians two new amendments to the ABM Treaty. At a time when almost everyone in America was saying let us relax the treaty so America can defend herself, what did the Clinton administration do? They negotiated with Russia two new tightening amendments that made the ABM Treaty tighter than it had been back in 1972.

Most of us in the Congress had no idea what the President was up to. We knew the amendments were dealing with multilateralizing the treaty, and the other dealt with something called demarcation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I called the State Department in 1997 and I obtained permission to go to Geneva. I think I am the only Member of either body that went over there during the discussions. I sat down at the negotiating table, alongside of me was our chief nego-

tiator, Stanley Rivalos. Across from me at the table was the chief Russian negotiator, General Koltunov. We met for 2½ hours.

The first question I asked General Koltunov was, General, tell me, why do you want to multilateralize the ABM Treaty, meaning bring other nations in? It was only a treaty between two countries, the Soviet Union and the U.S. Why do you want to bring in Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan? They do not have nuclear warheads nor long-range missiles. If you want to bring in former Soviet states, why did not you propose bringing them all in, all 15?

He looked at me. He said, Congressman, you are asking that question of the wrong person. We did not propose multilateralizing the ABM Treaty. Your side did.

I couldn't believe what I was hearing, Mr. Speaker. The Clinton administration went over to Geneva to negotiate a change in the treaty that brought in three former Soviet states to be equal signatories. Now, why would you do that, Mr. Speaker, unless, unless you wanted to make it tougher down the road to amend the treaty, because then you had to get four nations to agree as opposed to just Russia and the U.S.

The second issue was demarcation. I could not understand how we differentiated between a theater missile defense system and national missile defense. If you are in Israel, our THAAD program would be national missile defense, because it protects your whole country. You are a small country. So I said to General Koltunov on the Russian side, tell me, how do you make the difference between theater and national? How do you determine the speed and range that makes one system theater and one system national?

He said, Congressman, they are very delicate negotiations. I cannot explain it here. You have to go back and ask your scientists. So I came back home to America, not satisfied with the answers I got.

About a year later, Mr. Speaker, I got my answer. I was reading a press account in a Tel Aviv newspaper that Russia was trying to sell Israel its brand new latest missile defense system called the ANTEI-2500, A-N-T-E-I. They were also trying to sell the same system to Greece. I never heard of this system, and I know pretty much all of Russia's missile defense systems. I study them.

So I called the CIA and asked them to send an analyst over. The analyst came over to my office and brought a color brochure with him, in English. He handed me the brochure when he walked in my office and said Congressman, this is the ANTEI-2500.

I said, what is it? He said it is a brand new system that Russia is just now marketing. They are trying to sell it to Israel, Greece and other countries. He said I picked up this brochure at the air show in Abu Dhabi. The Russians were handing it out. It is in English. It is in color.

So I looked through the brochure, I still have the brochure in my office, and I turned through it to see all the pictures. And on the back page were all the technical capabilities of this new Russian system, including speed, intercept range and capabilities.

I looked at those figures and looked at the analyst and said, wait a minute. I have a hunch here that this system is right below the threshold of the demarcation that we got sucked into in Geneva, am I correct? He said yes, Congressman, you are correct. That is where the figure came from.

Well, we were in Geneva negotiating a definition of what is a theater system. The Russians knew they would be marketing the system a year later, so they wanted that demarcation to allow them to market that system, but deny us from going any better than that system. So we agreed to it.

President Clinton agreed to both of those changes in the ABM Treaty. So for the third time, we sent a signal to Russia. This third time the signal was we are going to tighten up the ABM Treaty. That is the policy of America.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? In our country we do live under a Constitution, and our Constitution says that no President can in fact negotiate a treaty without the advice and consent of the Senate. Now, President Clinton knows our Constitution very well, and he knew that when he negotiated those two changes in 1997, he had to submit them to the Senate for their advice and consent.

But, do you know what, Mr. Speaker? The President knew he could not get the votes to pass either one of them, even from his own party. So from 1997 until Bill Clinton left office, neither of those two changes to the ABM Treaty were submitted as required by our Constitution to the Senate. Yet the President convinced the Russians that that was our policy.

So the Russians last year, when they were ratifying START II, a very important treaty, the Duma attached those two treaty changes to the START II treaty itself. They had nothing to do with START II, but the Russians added those two protocols on. The Clinton administration, figuring they would tie the hands of the Senate, because if they could not submit those two changes separately by attaching them to START II, which the Russians ratified, they would force the Senate into a corner and they would have to ratify them as a part of START II ratification. That is why last summer the Senate said it would not take up START II. So, for the third time, the Clinton administration sent the wrong signal to Russia.

□ 2230

That is why the Russians do not trust us, Mr. Speaker, because they got terribly mixed signals during the past 8 years. That is all changing now. President Bush has said we want to work with Russia. We want to work with Eu-

rope. We will do missile defense together.

The Russians believe in missile defense. They have the SA-10, SA-12. They have the ANTEI-2500. They have the S-300, the S-400, S-500; and they have national missile defense.

They have an ABM system. They have all of those systems, some of the best systems in the world. Is it wrong then for America to want to defend ourselves? Now, there is one additional problem and reason why the Russians do not trust us, Mr. Speaker, and this is going to be a pretty provocative statement. It is actually caused by the very arms control groups in this city who claim to be the advocates of peace.

Do I have any proof to back that up? Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker. In the midst of the national missile defense debate in 1999, this article ran in Time Magazine, about Star Wars, the new version of missile defense, a two-page spread. The story is supposed to be about missile defense, defending our people and defending Russia's people.

Up here in the corner is this chart, which you cannot see, so I have had it blown up. What is the title of this chart, Mr. Speaker? "Destroying Russia. Arms control advocates map the Pentagon's top secret plan for waging war, 1,200 warheads hitting 80 targets, and they have the targets throughout Russia." Down at the bottom, "Killing zones, the vast spread of radiation wipe out more than 20 million Russian people."

Mr. Speaker, one of my best friends from Moscow was in my office and brought me this magazine. He threw it on my table and he said, Curt, I know what you are doing with missile defense, and I support you, but this is what the Russian people think you want. They see this story on missile defense in Time magazine, which is printed all over Russia; and they see a picture of a map destroying our country and killing 20 million people.

Who produced this chart, Mr. Speaker? The Natural Resources Defense Council. So the fear in Russia was not caused by missile defense. It was caused by the hate-mongering people in those arms control groups that have scared the Russian people into believing somehow we want to wipe out 20 million of their citizens.

And guess what, Mr. Speaker? They did it again. In this week's Newsweek magazine, there is another chart showing a nuclear hit in Russia. Again, it is attributed to Natural Resources Defense Council.

This will be on every news stand in Russia and will be the talk of the Russian people; and they will say to themselves, this is what America really wants, because their arms control people are telling this to their people; they want to destroy Russia.

They want to kill tens of millions of innocent Russian citizens. That is why Russians distrust us, Mr. Speaker. It is not because of what George Bush wants

to do. It is not because of what I want to do.

Tomorrow, I will lead discussions with Russia's leaders. We have 12 of their top Duma deputies in town, the first deputy speaker; and we will have discussions all day. I have been to Russia 26 times, Mr. Speaker.

I consider myself to be Russia's best friend in Congress, sometimes their toughest critic; but that is what good friends are for. This is not about backing Russia into a corner.

This is not about starting an arms race. This is not about bankrupting America. This is about protecting the American people. Mr. Speaker, if I wanted to hurt Russians, I would not have worked for the past 5 years on this project with the Russian Duma, which is to provide Russia for the first time with the Western-style mortgage program so that Russians can have houses like our middle-class people have in this country.

The program is called Houses for Our People. Almost every governor of every republic in Russia has given their stamp of approval for a program that we negotiated together to help Russian people buy homes.

We do not want to be Russia's enemy, but we sent the wrong signals to Russia over the past 8 years. We had an administration whose foreign policy toward Russia was like a roller coaster.

We backed them into a corner on the first NATO expansion. We went into Kosovo like wild people, trying to go in like cowboys from the Wild West, killing innocent Serbs instead of requiring Russia to help us.

We denied the fact that their Russian leaders were stealing billions of dollars of money that was supposed to help the Russian people, and we sent the wrong signals on missile defense.

All of that is changing now, Mr. Speaker, because we have a President who will treat the Russians with honesty and dignity. He has told the Russian leader face to face, eye to eye, we want to be your friend. We want to be your partner. We want to work with you economically. We want to help you with your environmental problems. We want to work with you on a mortgage program for your people. We want to help you grow your economy so that you become an aggressive trading partner with America.

All of us in this body and the other body should rally behind our President, and we should denounce those arms control groups in this city who use the distasteful practice of trying to convince the Russian people that somehow we are their enemy.

They are the warmonger, the people who put charts up who say that we somehow want to create a war that would wipe out 20 million Russians. They are the very warmongers, and we will not accept that. There is a place for arms control, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am not against treaties, as long as they are enforced, and that means we have to have the accountability; and we have to have the

enabling capability to observe in both countries with candor whether or not we are adhering to treaties.

If we use the three simple requirements that Ronald Reagan laid out in dealing with both Russia and China, strength, consistency and candor, we will not have a problem in this century. We want the same thing for the Russian people that President Putin wants; we want them to have a better life than they had. We want their kids to have better education. We want them to have homes for family. We want their Duma to become a strong part of governing their country.

We want the Russian people to eventually realize the same kind of dreams that we realize in America, but we are not going to allow the American people to remain vulnerable. We are not going to deny the reality of what is happening in rogue and terrorist states.

When Members of the other body, like the Senate Foreign Relations chairman, are disingenuous and say our real concern are weapons of mass destruction, we have to counter that, because we do not have a corner on that. All of us understand that threat, just as we do the threat from cyberterrorism and narcodrug trafficking, but the fact is we cannot ignore the threat of missile proliferation.

We must work on arms control agreements. We must work on stabilization and building confidence and trust, and we must build limited systems that give us that protection that we do not now have. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that in the end, Russia and America will be prime partners together.

We will work on technology together. The Russians have expertise that we do not have. Together we can protect our children and our children's children, and we can deny those rogue states the chance of harming Russians or Americans or others of our allies by working together.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join President Bush in this effort; and I applaud him for his meeting with President Putin, and I look forward to our meeting tomorrow with the leaders of the Russian Duma.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2216, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. SESSIONS (during Special Order of Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-105) on the resolution (H. Res. 171) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2216) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of the funeral of a friend.

Mr. CANNON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. ENGLISH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOUDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRUCCI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SESSIONS, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on June 18, 2001 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1914. To extend for 4 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 20, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2567. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of June 1, 2001, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 107-89); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2568. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Al-

lotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Galesburg, Illinois) [MM Docket No. 01-53; RM-10040] received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2569. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Monticello, Maine) [MM Docket No. 01-64; RM-10074] received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2570. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model 188A and 188C Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-265-AD; Amendment 39-11980; AD 2000-23-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2571. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 35, 35A, 36, and 36A Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-12026; AD 2000-24-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2572. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Models DG-500 Elan Series, DG-500M, and DG-500MB Sailplanes [Docket No. 99-CE-88-AD; Amendment 39-12005; AD 2000-23-32] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2573. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 707 and 720 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-378-AD; Amendment 39-12027; AD 2000-24-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2574. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-31-AD; Amendment 39-12018; AD 2000-24-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2575. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft, Inc., SA226 Series and SA227 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-CE-41-AD; Amendment 39-11885; AD 2000-17-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2576. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-47-AD; Amendment 39-11947; AD 2000-22-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2577. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model

BH.125, DH.125, and HS.125 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-345-AD; Amendment 39-11943; AD 2000-21-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2578. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 47B, 47B-3, 47D, 47D-1, 47G, 47G-2, 47G2A, 47G-2A-1, 47G-3, 47G-3B, 47G-3B-1, 47G-3B-2, 47G-3B-2A, 47G-4, 47G-4A, 47G-5, 47G-5A, 47H-1, 47J, 47J-2, 47J-2A, and 47K Helicopters [Docket No. 2000-SW-35-AD; Amendment 39-11983; AD 2000-18-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2579. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes Powered by Pratt & Whitney JT9D-7 Series Engines [Docket No. 2000-NM-270-AD; Amendment 39-11886; AD 2000-18-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2580. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737, 747, 757, 767, and 777 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-81-AD; Amendment 39-12240; AD 2001-10-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2581. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; American Champion Aircraft Corporation 7, 8, and 11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-CE-121-AD; Amendment 39-12036; AD 2000-25-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2582. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-80 Series Airplanes and Model MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-164-AD; Amendment 39-12225; AD 2001-09-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2583. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-76A, S-76B, and S-76C Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-05-AD; Amendment 39-12232; AD 2001-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2584. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. AT-400, AT-500, and AT-800 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-CE-72-AD; Amendment 39-12230; AD 2001-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2585. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model L-1011-385 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-314-AD; Amendment 39-11884; AD 2000-17-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Com-

mittee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2586. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF34 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-42-AD; Amendment 39-12229; AD 2001-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2587. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-80C2 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-12233; AD 2001-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2588. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF34 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-49-AD; Amendment 39-12228; AD 2000-03-03 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2216. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SKEEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2217. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2001 (Rept. 107-104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 171. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2216) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-105). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. STARK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2211. A bill to prohibit the importation of any article that is produced, manufactured, or grown in Burma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 2212. A bill to make the income tax rate reductions in the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COMBEST:

H.R. 2213. A bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American agricultural producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2214. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the Air Force Assistant Surgeon General for Dental Services to serve in the grade of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2215. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 2216. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SKEEN:

H.R. 2217. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2218. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for coverage under that Act of employees of States and political subdivisions of States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 2219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the Hope Scholarship Credit to cover fees, books, supplies, and equipment and to exempt Federal Pell Grants and Federal supplemental educational opportunity grants from reducing expenses taken into account for the Hope Scholarship Credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. KLECZKA):

H.R. 2220. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payment under the Medicare Program for four hemodialysis treatments per week for certain patients, to provide for an increased update in the composite payment rate for dialysis treatments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2221. A bill to ban the import of large capacity ammunition feeding devices, to promote the safe storage and use of handguns by consumers, and to extend Brady background checks to gun shows; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2222. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements to the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance life insurance program for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2223. A bill to amend chapter 51 of title 38, United States Code, to pay certain benefits received by veterans through the

date of their death rather than through the last day of the preceding month; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend the Low-Income Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to provide supplemental funds for States with programs to facilitate the collection of private donations by utilities to be used for payment of the utility bills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 2225. A bill to prohibit certain election-related activities by foreign nationals; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 2226. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to protect the equal participation of eligible voters in campaigns for election for Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2227. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to give certain rights to Department of Defense employees with respect to actions or determinations under Office of Management and Budget Circular A0976; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2228. A bill to establish a program of assistance to families of passengers and crew members involved in maritime disasters; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2229. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the unearned income of children attributable to personal injury awards shall not be taxed at the marginal rate of the parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 2230. A bill to amend section 211 of the Clean Air Act to prohibit the use of the fuel additive MTBE in gasoline; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 2231. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to patent reexamination proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD (for herself, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 2232. A bill to provide, with respect to diabetes in minority populations, for an increase in the extent of activities carried out by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 2233. A bill assist municipalities and local communities to explore and determine options for the alternative provision of electricity and to create new public power systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASTOR:

H.R. 2234. A bill to revise the boundary of the Tumacacori National Historical Park in

the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 2235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to establish voluntary protection programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RADANOVICH:

H.R. 2236. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to expand the flexibility of customized training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RAMSTAD (for himself, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SABO, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 2237. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the conducting of certain games of chance shall not be treated as an unrelated trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (for himself and Mr. HILLEARY):

H.R. 2238. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire Fern Lake and the surrounding watershed in the States of Kentucky and Tennessee for addition to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BACA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 2239. A bill to reform certain laws affecting child labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

H.R. 2240. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3719 Highway 4 in Jay, Florida, as the "Joseph W. Westmoreland Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2241. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2242. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish Flag Day as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to ensure improved access to employment opportunities for low-income people; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. RILEY, and Mr. EHLERS):

H.R. 2244. A bill to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to require State legislative approval of new gambling facilities, to provide for minimum requirements for Federal regulation of Indian gaming, to set up a commission to report to Congress on current living and health standards in Indian country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. LEE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KING, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HORN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that security, reconciliation, and prosperity for all Cypriots can be best achieved within the context of membership in the European Union which will provide significant rights and obligations for all Cypriots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD:

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that continual research and education into the cause and cure for fibroid cancer be addressed; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr.

BACA, Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HAYWORTH, Ms. LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 166. Concurrent resolution recognizing the invaluable contribution of Native American Veterans and honoring their service to the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRUCCI (for himself, Mrs.

MALONEY of New York, Mr. KING, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 172. A resolution honoring John J. Downing, Brian Fahey, and Harry Ford, who lost their lives in the course of duty as firefighters; to the Committee on Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

114. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 134 memorializing the United States Congress to expand and fund federal agricultural conservation programs, including the Conservation Reserve, Wetlands Reserve, Environmental Quality Incentives, Wildlife Habitat Improvement, and Forestry Incentives Programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. LANTOS introduced a bill (H.R. 2245) for the relief of Anisha Goveas Foti; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. KELLER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. DEMINT.
 H.R. 17: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 68: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 85: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 91: Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. NEY, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.,
 H.R. 159: Mr. SCHROCK and Mr. ISAKSON.
 H.R. 162: Mr. FROST and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 190: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 250: Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 267: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 280: Mr. SAXTON.
 H.R. 281: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 303: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BOYD, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 323: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BONIOR, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 331: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 369: Mr. KELLER.
 H.R. 479: Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 480: Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 482: Ms. HART.
 H.R. 488: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
 H.R. 500: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. WU.
 H.R. 504: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 526: Ms. WATERS, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 527: Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 556: Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 572: Mr. BLUNT.
 H.R. 600: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 612: Mr. WU, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SAXTON.
 H.R. 632: Ms. NORTON and Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 647: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. TANCREDO.
 H.R. 652: Mr. EVANS and Mr. HILLIARD.
 H.R. 653: Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 717: Mr. CONDIT and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
 H.R. 747: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 786: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Mr. MATSUI.
 H.R. 814: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 817: Mrs. NORTUP.
 H.R. 818: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 822: Mr. FLETCHER.
 H.R. 831: Mr. COCKSEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BARRETT, Ms. LEE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GOODE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 839: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 843: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 912: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.
 H.R. 950: Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 952: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 954: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 969: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
 H.R. 978: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1008: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.R. 1073: Mr. HOYER, Mr. HORN, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1076: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REYES, and Mr. SAWYER.
 H.R. 1086: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1089: Mr. VITTER.
 H.R. 1090: Mr. HOLT, Mr. SHAW, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1097: Ms. LEE, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1109: Mr. RILEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. GILCHREST.
 H.R. 1110: Mr. LINDER and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
 H.R. 1111: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 1121: Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 1139: Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 1170: Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 1176: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 1194: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 1202: Mr. TURNER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 1220: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1262: Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 1291: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. OSBORNE.
 H.R. 1304: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 1305: Mr. GORDON, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1340: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 1343: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 1350: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1351: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 1353: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. WELLER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. PICKERING, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. SWEENEY.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. LAFALCE.
 H.R. 1371: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1377: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. ARMEY.
 H.R. 1381: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 1382: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 1388: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 1391: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1392: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1393: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1394: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1395: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1396: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1397: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1400: Mr. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 1405: Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 1406: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 1433: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1434: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 1443: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1462: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 1468: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 1485: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
 H.R. 1488: Mr. HOFFFEL.
 H.R. 1496: Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 1517: Mr. UPTON and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 1543: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1553: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 1556: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. GRUCCI.
 H.R. 1607: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 1609: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SWEENEY, Ms. HART, and Mr. FORD.
 H.R. 1624: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. COYNE.
 H.R. 1644: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1672: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 1704: Mrs. NORTUP and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 1707: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 1718: Mr. KIND, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DEMINT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 1739: Mr. CLAY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. HOFFFEL, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1770: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1773: Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 1780: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. BARCIA.
 H.R. 1793: Mr. SCHROCK.
 H.R. 1795: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. KIRK.
 H.R. 1798: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. KLECZKA.
 H.R. 1815: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 1842: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mrs. THURMAN.
 H.R. 1847: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1851: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1864: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 1882: Mr. OWENS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. FALOMAVAEGA.
 H.R. 1887: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 1908: Mr. GRAVES.
 H.R. 1911: Mr. GOODE and Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1922: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1927: Mr. UPTON and Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 1939: Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 1945: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1950: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 1954: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1961: Mr. BURR of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1974: Mr. LEWIS of California.
 H.R. 1979: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. STUMP, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 1980: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KING, and Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 1986: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 1990: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 1992: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 1993: Mr. BAKER, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. MCINNIS.
 H.R. 2001: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. TAUZIN.
 H.R. 2005: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 2018: Mr. CANTOR, Ms. WATERS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.
 H.R. 2064: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 2074: Mr. BARRETT, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 2081: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 2097: Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFazio, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
 H.R. 2103: Mr. HOBSON.
 H.R. 2104: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 2108: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2109: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mrs. THURMAN.
 H.R. 2112: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 2117: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 2118: Mr. WOLF, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2123: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. WILSON, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 2134: Mr. LANTOS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 2143: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2145: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. HART.

H.R. 2148: Mr. SNYDER and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2149: Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KERNS, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 2158: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2166: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 2167: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 2177: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2181: Mr. WICKER, Mr. HILLIARD, AND Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.J. Res. 36: Mr. PENCE, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. REYES, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. HYDE.

H.J. Res. 42: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. PHELPS and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Con. Res. 64: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 142: Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Con. Res. 152: Mr. EHLERS.

H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. BACA.

H. Con. Res. 163: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 105: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 124: Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. OWENS, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. KELLER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Ms. McCollum, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. SCHROCK.

H. Res. 139: Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 152: Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H. Res. 160: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KING, Ms. LEE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. QUINN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. VITTE.

H. Res. 168: Mr. WAXMAN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 877: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 2188: Mr. FROST and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2172: Mr. WOLF, Mr. OWENS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2216

OFFERED BY: Mr. DEFazio

AMENDMENT No. 1: In chapter 1 of title I, in the paragraph under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$24,500,000)".

H.R. 2216

OFFERED BY: Mr. KUCINICH

AMENDMENT No. 2: In chapter 1 of title I, in the paragraph under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$55,000,000)".

H.R. 2216

OFFERED BY: Mr. SANDERS

AMENDMENT No. 3: Title II, chapter 5, at the end of the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES—Administration for Children and Families Low Income Home Energy Assistance" insert the following:

For "Low Income Home Energy Assistance" under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) for fiscal year 2002, \$2,000,000,000.